

THIRTY FIVE CENTS

OCTOBER, 1953

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

THE TREASON OF THE SENATE

HARVEY O'CONNOR

THE SUCCESSES OF MR. DULLES

THE EDITORS

MALENKOV'S SECRET WEAPON

A STUDENT OF THE USSR

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

LEO HUBERMAN

VOL. 5

6

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEETZ

CONTENTS

VOLUME FIVE

NUMBER SIX

OCTOBER, 1953

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: The Successes of Mr. Dulles	225
HOW PLEASANT TO BE MR. DULLES! by Sagitterius	232
THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING by Leo Huberman	233
CARTOON by Fred Wright	240
REFLECTIONS ON JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS by Paul M. Sweezy	245
THE TREASON OF THE SENATE by Harvey O'Connor	251
MALENKOV'S SECRET WEAPON by A Student of the USSR	255
THE LABOR MOVEMENT: Labor Unity in Sight At Last? by Arthur Eggleston	262
NATIONALISM AND LABOR IN IRELAND by Andrew Boyd	268
"LEST WE FORGET" by John Bowman	276
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing	277
EMPIRE BUILDING: 1953 STYLE — A COMMENT by Julian Friedman	284

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1953, by Monthly Review, Inc.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICE: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York. Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.

MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—\$3.00 (foreign, \$3.50); two years—\$5.00 (foreign \$6.00).
By 1st class mail — United States \$5; everywhere else \$6.
By air mail — No. America \$7; So. America \$13; Europe \$17; Asia \$24.
Single copy 35c; 15 or more 25c. (Vol. 1 No. 1 \$2.00; Vol. 2 No. 6 \$2.00).

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Every issue of MR is carefully proofread by the editors and by two additional experts in the art. Our joint apologies, therefore, for the stupid mistake that got by all of us in the Huberman article on the Harvey O'Connor case in the September issue. On p. 214 it was stated—quite correctly—that O'Connor had been cited for contempt of the Senate and that indictment was a *possible next eventuality*. Then, on the very next page, there occurs the statement that "O'Connor *has* been indicted." It hit us all in the eye the minute we opened the completed magazine, but by that time it was too late since mailings to subscribers had already gone out.

(continued on inside back cover)

THE SUCCESSES OF MR. DULLES

John Foster Dulles, currently capitalism's chief operative on the international scene, has had a busy summer. And it must be admitted that he has scored a series of undoubted successes. Here are the most noteworthy, listed in approximate chronological order:

(1) The "mutual" assistance treaty with Syngman Rhee, coupled with a mutual promise to walk out of the Korean peace conference in 90 days if Messrs. Dulles and Rhee decide that the conference is not making progress—which means, in effect, if it has failed to turn all of Korea over to the South Korean dictator.

(2) The declaration of the 16 UN powers with troops in Korea threatening that any renewal of hostilities would mean full-scale war against China.

(3) The defeat in the UN General Assembly of the majority-backed proposal to include India in the Korean peace conference.

(4) The overthrow of the Mossedegh regime in Iran and the institution of an American-subsidized military dictatorship under the Shah and the Nazi sympathizer General Zahedi.

(5) The decisive victory of Adenauer's government in the West German general election of September 7th.

The first three of these achievements virtually guarantee the failure of the peace conference and set the stage for the Dulles-Rhee team—which had a good deal to do with starting the Korean War in the first place—to start up the fighting again and, if they choose, turn the Korean War into a general Far Eastern War. They may not want to go so far at this time, but it is clear that the situation they have created effectively cancels the relaxation of tension which set in immediately following the armistice and which ordinary people all over the world hoped would be but the prelude to a general Far Eastern settlement.

The coup in Iran put an end—for the time being, at least—to the most hopeful developments that unfortunate country has wit-

nessed for a long time, that is to say, a trend to the Left in domestic politics and a serious effort to establish more friendly and fruitful relations between Iran and the Soviet Union. But of course a rational solution of Iran's problems, which obviously can come only through drastic reforms and good relations with her largest neighbor, would mean (to Mr. Dulles) that Iran had "slipped behind the iron curtain," wherefore the Shah-Zahedi putsch must be accounted a resounding Dulles success.

Finally, Mr. Dulles' greatest triumph was the German election. Adenauer is the very embodiment of the Acheson-Dulles foreign policy: integration of Western Europe under Vatican spiritual and United States military leadership, followed by an attempt, by threat or war, to unify Germany and "liberate" Eastern Europe. Defeat for Adenauer, coming so close on the heels of the defeat of De Gasperi in Italy, would have been a severe and perhaps even a fatal blow to that policy. By the same token, Adenauer's victory has given it a new lease on life. Any chance of peacefully reuniting Germany through Big Four negotiations has been effectively killed for a long time to come; the European Defense Community (or, alternatively, the independent rearming of West Germany) is back again in the realm of practical politics.

Dulles must have had an anxious and distressing time during the spring and early summer. The Soviet-bloc peace offensive, launched soon after Stalin's death, had profound repercussions all over the world. When even Churchill, an old hand at the anti-Bolshevik game and one of the architects of the Cold War, came out for early top-level negotiations, it seemed to most people that a genuine settlement was possible, both in Asia and in Europe. This impression, taken together with the profound desire of people everywhere for peace, became a powerful political force in its own right, threatening to present the United States with the fateful alternative: *either negotiate in good faith and in a spirit of live and let live, or face the breakup of the American-led coalition.* Both possibilities being anathema to Dulles, his main concern could only be to recreate the atmosphere of tension and hopelessness in which America's satellites would once again accept their role uncomplainingly and the cold warriors could continue to plot and plan the ultimate downfall of world socialism.

The meaning of the events of the past few weeks is that Dulles has largely achieved his goal. No one any longer imagines that a Far Eastern settlement is in the offing. Rhee and Dulles have engineered it so that the Korean conference is more likely to be a prelude to war than peace. (In the words of the *New Statesman and Nation* of August 15th, "an objective analysis of the situation as it now exists

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

points, on the face of it, to a steady march towards war round about the turn of the year." No one in his right mind would have said that three months earlier!) Nor, with Adenauer firmly entrenched in power for four more years, can there be any further illusions about the possibility of an early German settlement, which must be the heart and core of a European settlement.

The threat of peace has subsided. Dulles can breathe easily again. He has acquired time, the most precious of all assets to a hard-pressed politician.

And yet his worries are far from over. International tensions have been restored and the *immediate* danger of a breakup of the American-dominated coalition has been averted, but the longer-run outlook is in many ways worse than it was a few months ago. During the summer, France entered a period of profound political crisis which, as we pointed out in last month's Review of the Month, carries a serious threat to American plans both in Europe and (via Indo-China) in Asia. Should a Popular Front government come to power in France—and the August strike wave has certainly increased the chance that it will—Mr. Dulles would have to fear the following terrifying (to him) developments: (1) A negotiated settlement of the Indo-China War, which from the American point of view would be tantamount to "losing Southeast Asia to Communism"; and (2) final rejection by France of the European Defense Community. If the United States should attempt to counter the latter move by unilateral arming of Germany, there would be grave danger of France's jumping the reservation altogether and seeking safety in a revitalized alliance with the Soviet Union—after all, what else was Soviet Premier Malenkov inviting when he said in his speech of August 10th, "We do not forget that the Soviet Union and France have an agreement of alliance and mutual assistance, which could serve as a basis for the development and the strengthening of the relations between our two countries, and serve the cause of insuring European security"?

Indo-China and France are thus two closely related danger spots for Mr. Dulles, and it is safe to assume that he is laying his plans for dealing with them. Moreover, in the case of Indo-China what he said in his speech to the American Legion on September 2nd clearly revealed (for those who know how to read such pronouncements) the lines along which his thinking runs. This is the relevant passage:

In Indo-China a desperate struggle is in its eighth year. The outcome affects our own vital interests in the Western Pacific, and we are already contributing largely in material and

MONTHLY REVIEW

money to the combined efforts of the French and of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

We Americans have too little appreciated the magnitude of the effort and sacrifices which France has made in defense of an area which is no longer a French colony but where complete independence is now in the making. This independence program is along lines which the United States has encouraged and justifies increased United States aid, provided that will assure an effort there that is vigorous and decisive.

Communist China has been and now is training, equipping and supplying the Communist forces in Indo-China. There is the risk that, as in Korea, Red China might send its own army into Indo-China. The Chinese Communist regime should realize that such a second aggression could not occur without grave consequences which might not be confined to Indo-China.

What this means is that the United States has decided to turn Indo-China into an American protectorate on the model of South Korea, to build up enough military strength to crush the Vietminh, and to bomb and blockade China if she comes to the assistance of the Vietminh as she came to the assistance of North Korea three years ago. In other words, Dulles is in effect asserting the right of the United States to take over Indo-China and threatening all-out war to deter the Chinese from taking measures to prevent the establishment on their borders of a major military power which has repeatedly avowed its irreconcilable hostility not only to their government but to their whole social order.

What this implies is an extremely risky gamble on the depth of the Chinese desire for peace. Whether it would work or lead to World War III we have no way of knowing, but before it can even be tried there is one stumbling block which must be overcome—France. The present French government appears to want to play ball with Mr. Dulles. That is the only possible meaning of the so-called Navarre Plan, reported to have the endorsement of the Laniel cabinet, which calls for an increased commitment of French troops to Indo-China in exchange for a large expansion in American aid, and which would inevitably end up with the Americans running the whole show, militarily as well as economically. But everyone, including Mr. Dulles, knows that the present French government is not likely to last long and that the next French government is not unlikely to be a government of the Left which will favor ending the Indo-China War through negotiations with the Vietminh, thus cutting the United States out altogether. Here we come to what must be Mr. Dulles' real nightmare these days—that off-stage French Popular Front government which would at one and the same time wind up the Indo-

China War and throw a monkey wrench into the best-laid plans for a German-spearheaded military coalition against the USSR.

We don't know how Mr. Dulles is planning to cope with this menace should it materialize, but it would be foolish to suppose that he is neglecting the problem. And it is entirely within the bounds of possibility that his recent success in Iran has suggested a formula to him. It would run something like this: If you are in danger of "losing" a country to Communism (or just to plain commonsensism), organize an army coup and install a safely reactionary authoritarian regime which can be counted on to sign up for the duration in the American Crusade. It's not exactly a new formula, of course. Hitler and Mussolini used it in Spain, against another Popular Front of famous memory, and the Franco regime is a continuing reminder of their success. Dulles may well hope, if the need should arise, to duplicate their feat in France.

This is not to suggest, of course, that Dulles or any other Americans can make and unmake French governments at will—as, for example, France herself did in Morocco only last month. But it is to imply that in proportion as France approaches a new Popular Front era, the forces of the French Right will increasingly look for their salvation to the army and to some new man on horseback (informed speculation now casts General Alphonse Juin, former Nazi collaborator and now commander of NATO ground forces, in this all-too-familiar role). American encouragement and aid could easily be the critical factor in deciding the French Right to take the plunge. Mr. Dulles has doubtless taken this into account in laying his plans; it would be prudent for everyone else concerned—which means primarily the French and American peoples—to do likewise.

There is one more specter which must be haunting Mr. Dulles and marring the enjoyment of his recent successes—Japan. In the Acheson-Dulles conception of global strategy, as we have frequently pointed out in these pages, Japan is to play the same role in Asia as Germany in Europe—that of warhead in an antisocialist coalition. Adenauer's victory in Germany brings the arming of West Germany into the realm of practical diplomacy and politics; never have relations between the United States and Adenauer's Reich been so close and untroubled. Things have been going very differently in Japan. There, in the most recent election (April 19, 1953), Yoshida, who in the postwar period has played a role in Japan very similar to that of Adenauer in Germany, lost ground to his chief right-wing rivals, while the Left as a whole made significant gains—trends which are the reverse of those registered in the German election. The following comparative data are instructive:

MONTHLY REVIEW

Percentages of Total Vote*

GERMANY

	1953	1949
Adenauer party	45	31
Three main right-wing parties	58	47
Minor parties and independents	11	17
Socialists and Communists	31	35

JAPAN

	1953	1952
Yoshida party	39	48
Three main right-wing parties**	66	66
Minor parties and independents	5	10
Socialists and Communists***	30	25

* Rounded to nearest percentage point

** These were two parties in 1952

*** Includes Labor-Farmer Party

The 1953 figures seem to show a remarkable similarity in the political situation in the two countries, but the *trends* are in opposite directions; and it is the trends that count most under present conditions. Moreover, when account is taken of the fact that the two Japanese elections listed were separated by only six months, while the German elections were separated by four years, the magnitude of the Japanese changes takes on all the greater significance.

If the German statistics point toward rearmament and closer West German-American relations, the Japanese statistics point precisely the other way. And everything that has happened in Japan since last April's election testifies to the accuracy of the statistical weathercock. In vain does Mr. Dulles importune the Japanese to get on with the job of rearming (most recently in his press conference of September 2nd). Yoshida and his fellow right-wing politicians are willing, even anxious, to comply but they dare not for fear of the political consequences: in one of history's greatest ironies, they take refuge behind the no-rearmament clause of the Constitution devised for them in the early postwar period by that great pacifist General Douglas MacArthur. But the Japanese malady goes beyond mere refusal to arm, which is certainly bad enough from Mr. Dulles' point of view. It includes a hankering for normal relations, and above all for an expansion of trade, with China and other countries on the Asian mainland. How widespread this hankering is was shown immediately after the signing of the Korean armistice when the Japanese Diet *unanimously* approved a resolution calling for more trade with China. "Significantly," reported the *New York Times* the next day

(July 30), "many members of Mr. Yoshida's own Liberal Party were in the vanguard of those who urged passage of the resolution and no Liberals opposed." The Japanese malady also includes an increasingly severe case of emotional anti-Americanism—resentment against the continued presence of United States armed forces on Japanese soil and fury engendered by such incidents as the dispossession of the whole village of Uchinada, with a population of some 6500 souls, to make room for an American base and artillery range. ANTI-AMERICANISM IN JAPAN REPORTED GAINING STRONGLY reads a headline in the *New York Times* of September 7th; private letters from Japanese friends indicate that this is, if anything, an understatement.

Clearly, Japan is not developing into the kind of reliable Far Eastern crusader that Mr. Dulles' plans call for. Nor is it easy to see what he can do to remedy the situation—beyond the kind of berating and wheedling at which Mr. Dulles is certainly an adept but which seems to produce strictly limited practical results. Applying economic pressure would make the China trade look all the more attractive, and there is as yet no army in Japan on which to base an authoritarian-military regime on the Iranian model: as long as the people successfully resist rearmament, adventures such as are quite possible in France will be ruled out in Japan. Of course while Japan remains an American-occupied country she can be prevented from entering into any relations with China and the USSR of which the Americans disapprove. But that's about all American soldiers can accomplish: they cannot remold Japan into an effective instrument of American policy. And without this instrument, America's whole Far Eastern policy, as it has taken shape under Messrs. Acheson and Dulles, is utterly unrealistic. (For a further development of this point, see the article beginning on page 245, "Reflections on Japanese-American Relations," by Paul M. Sweezy.) This is Mr. Dulles' dilemma—to others, it should be a source of hope that some day American policy may be brought back into the realm of the possible, the rational, and the humane.

But, unfortunately, that is a hope for the future, not for now. The immediate problem, raised by Mr. Dulles' recent successes, is quite different. Last spring it seemed that it might be possible to attain a lasting peace. Now once again we are faced with the task of preventing a horrible war. Mr. Dulles is certainly entitled to congratulate himself on the momentous character of the change brought about by his summer labors.

(September 15, 1953)

HOW PLEASANT TO BE MR. DULLES!

(After Edward Lear)

"We don't now have to be constantly taking international public opinion polls to find out what others want, and then doing what it seems will make us popular." Mr. Dulles, September 2, 1953.

How pleasant to be Mr. Dulles,
Who steers the Department of State!
His style is less polished than Tully's,
But his arguments carry more weight.

His mind is hide-bound and tenacious,
His mouth is remarkably big,
But if his remarks sound pugnacious,
Mr. Dulles need not care a fig.

Assured of the States' solidarity
When seeking a showdown by force,
He need not invite popularity
(Except with the Germans, of course.)

His outlook is quite hemispherical,
He's a hundred-per-cent Sinophobe,
And his henchmen get simply hysterical
When he bawls out one half of the globe.

His method is not diplomatic,
Which is what the Republicans like;
And his orders are made more emphatic
By the silence of President Ike.

His tone is abrupt and commanding,
He scorns to conceal the big stick,
He has only one talent outstanding,
The talent for dropping the brick.

His dictates for allies' behavior
Down the throat of the free world are rammed.
At home—he is liberty's savior,
Abroad—he is Dulles the Damned!

—Sagittarius

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING: THE GREAT CAPITALIST HOAX

BY LEO HUBERMAN

Today one finds the physical benefits of our society distributed widely, to almost everyone, with scant regard to status, class or origin of the individual.

—David E. Lilienthal,
Big Business: A New Era, 1952, p. 202.

In my land, we have been traveling straight toward Karl Marx' dream.

For America is closer to "absolute equality" of income today than any other nation in the world. . . .

We have virtually wiped out the very poor and poor classes.

—Sylvia Porter,
New York Post, January 7, 1953

There are, in fact, *two* great capitalist hoaxes. The first is that our economic system is one of "free competitive enterprise"; the second is that we have a "high standard of living."

Most radicals are on to the first hoax. They are aware of the lie in the claim that ours is a competitive, free economy. They know that the exact opposite is true—that by far the most important part of our economic system is monopolized and controlled. What the propagandists call "the traditional American system of free competitive enterprise" began to change back in the 1870s, over 80 years ago. In its place, today, there is concentration of economic power in a few hands—monopoly. This we are all aware of.

But the other hoax, the one about the high American standard of living, continues to fool all too many people. I want to spend my time, tonight, on the myth that Americans are well off—that with very few exceptions, they eat good food, live in comfortable homes, wear nice clothes, and enjoy wonderful luxuries.

Let me begin by saying that one aspect of this claim is indeed correct. It is true that *relative* to the inhabitants of most other coun-

This is the text of a talk given at a birthday party for MR (the magazine's fourth) by Monthly Review Associates, New York City, May 14, 1953.

MONTHLY REVIEW

tries in the world, our people *are* better off, that is to say, we *do* have a higher standard of living. But that only means, I suggest, not that we are well off, but that the others are worse off. It does not mean what the propagandists want us to believe when they talk about the American "high standard of living."

It was President Roosevelt, you will recall, who broke through the mist of lies about our high standard of living when he said, in his Second Inaugural Address: "I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished."

That was 1937, a depression year. Surely the picture has changed for the better since that time? How much better?

Well, let us see. The latest, most complete figures we have are for 1950, one of our most prosperous years, the year in which the Korean War started. Here are the figures put out by the Bureau of the Census:

TABLE A
Distribution of Families By Total Money Income
For the United States: 1950
(All figures rounded out)

<i>Family Income</i>	<i>Families Number of</i>	<i>Percent in each group</i>	<i>Cumulative percent</i>
Total	39,800,000	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000	4,600,000	11.5	11.5
\$1,000 to \$1,999	5,200,000	13.2	24.7
\$2,000 to 2,999	7,100,000	17.8	42.5
\$3,000 to 3,999	8,200,000	20.7	63.2
\$4,000 to 4,999	5,400,000	13.6	76.8
\$5,000 to 5,999	3,600,000	9.0	85.8
\$6,000 to 6,999	2,100,000	5.2	91.0
\$7,000 to 9,999	2,300,000	5.8	96.8
\$10,000 and over	1,300,000	3.3	100.1

[U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-60, No. 9,
March 25, 1952]

Note that the total number of families in the country was 39.8 million. (Unrelated individuals, another nine million persons, are not shown here, so as to keep the picture simple and clear.)

Under the heading *Family Income*, at the left, the first classification is "Under \$1,000." Note that there were 4.6 million families in this income group; this was 11.5 percent of all the families. This means roughly, that one out of every nine families in the United States got under \$1,000 income for the year 1950. That was less than \$20 a week *per family*, not *per individual*.

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

Now run your finger along the second classification—the \$1,000 to \$1,999 group. Added to the first classification we get the cumulative percentage figure of 24.7, just short of 25 percent. This means that almost one out of every four families in the United States, in 1950, had less than \$40 a week to live on.

Follow the \$4,000 to \$4,999 figure across and we learn that 76.8 percent, or more than three out of every four American families, were getting less than \$5,000 a year, or less than \$100 a week. If your family income is \$100 a week or more, you are in a select company—only one in every four families are in your bracket.

The \$10,000-and-over bracket is, of course, much more select. Only 3.3 percent of all American families were in that class, one out of every 33 families.

Now note this interesting comparison: each of the 1.3 million families that were getting \$10,000 and over, got for the one year 1950 at least as much as the 11 percent of the families in the under \$1,000 group would have to work 10 years to get.

This, then, is the true income picture, as nearly accurate as possible, taken not from a radical publication, but from an indisputable source—the regular Census of the United States. For how many families was the phrase our "American high standard of living" a reality? We don't need to guess. We *know*—again from indisputable government sources.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the United States Department of Labor, puts out what it calls a "City Workers' Family Budget." It describes the goods and services needed to maintain "a modest but adequate level of living for a four-person urban family." This budget would give a family of four the "necessary minimum to meet the conventional and social as well as the biological needs."

Now the cost of this "modest but adequate" level-of-living budget, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, ranged from \$3,453 in New Orleans to \$3,933 in Milwaukee. That was for a four-person family, in the year 1950. The Bureau also gives estimates of the amount of income needed to attain the same budget for a family of two persons, of three, of five, and so on. With these estimates, plus the data from the Census Bureau, we learn that 19,980,000 families, or 50.2 percent of all American families, got less than the amount needed to pay for the Bureau of Labor Statistics "modest but adequate" budget.^{1*}

One-half of all the families in the United States did not get enough money to buy the "necessary minimum" of the goods and

^{1*} References will be found at the end of the article.

MONTHLY REVIEW

services they needed. But let us examine this BLS yardstick—perhaps its budget requirements are extravagant. We get an idea of the standard of living provided in this budget, which half our families could not meet, from some of the amounts provided. Listen:

Food—The BLS Budget allowance per person for meat, eggs, milk, and fresh vegetables was less than the actual average consumption per capita in the United States in the depression years of 1935-1939.

Clothing—The BLS Budget allows the father of the family an overcoat every six and one-half years, a raincoat every twelve and one-half years. It allows the mother a heavy winter coat every six years, a wool suit every nine years, a bathrobe every twenty years.

Household Equipment—The family could have a cookstove, refrigerator, and vacuum cleaner if it could find a way to finance them in payments extending over a term of 17 years.

Recreation—One low-priced car every 15 years; one daily newspaper, 32 magazines a year, one book a year, 19 movies, one ticket a year for each family member for plays, concerts, or sports events; nine cigarettes a day, one telephone call every third day, and a stamp for a 3-cent letter every week.²

This will give you an idea of the budget which one-half of all American families could not attain in the year 1950.

Now look, please, at Table B. This shows the distribution of income, by color.

TABLE B
Percentage Distribution of Families By Total Money Income
By Color, For the United States: 1950 (All figures rounded out)

Family Income	Cumulative Percent in each group	Cumulative Percent White	Cumulative Percent Non-White
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000	11.5	10	28
\$1,000 to 1,999	24.7	22	53
\$2,000 to 2,999	42.5	39.5	77
\$3,000 to 3,999	63.2	61	90
\$4,000 to 4,999	76.8	75	95
\$5,000 to 5,999	85.8	85	97
\$6,000 to 6,999	91.0	90	98
\$7,000 to 9,999	96.8	96.4	99.8
\$10,000 and over	100.1	99.9	100.1
Median Income	\$3,319	\$3,445	\$1,869

[U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-60, No. 9,
March 23, 1952]

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

Note the following significant facts:

While one out of every ten white families was getting less than \$1,000 a year, or \$20 a week, 28 percent, or almost one in every three Negro families, was getting that pitiful sum.

More than half the Negro families got less than \$40 a week. Only one in ten Negro families got over \$4,000 a year—that is, roughly \$80 a week.

Only three-tenths of one percent of all Negro families got \$10,000 a year.

The median income for all families was \$3,319; for whites it was \$3,445; for Negro families it was only 54 percent as much, or \$1,869.

From an excellent book entitled, *The World The Dollar Built*, by Gunther Stein, which MR plans to publish this fall, we learn the following further interesting facts about Negro income:

One-half of all 'non-whites' earn on an average only about \$185 a year per capita. This is . . . an annual income . . . barely one-third that of the average citizen of France and Belgium, the recipients of American aid—to which the poor of the United States, including 'non-whites' contribute heavily through direct and indirect taxes.³

"The fact is shocking but true," said the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 82nd Congress, 1951, "that it is those in the lowest-income bracket who already bear a disproportionate share of the tax burden."⁴

And, incidentally, it is the lower-income groups, too, contrary to popular assumption, that bear the burden of private charity. "Eighty-two percent of it," according to the Russell Sage Foundation, "is provided in individually small sums by people with incomes of less than \$5,000 a year."⁵

We know, of course, that many of the poorest families in the United States go without adequate food, clothing, and shelter to buy, on installment, what some of us consider needless luxuries, like television sets. But those of us who are quick to criticize these poor people would do well to pay attention to the study entitled, significantly, "Making Ends Meet On Less Than \$2,000 A Year" by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

There is understandable impatience on the part of those in comfortable circumstances when people reach out beyond their means to grasp at the alluring new devices which our country has to offer on every hand But perhaps those of us who feel

MONTHLY REVIEW

we do wiser spending should pause a moment and consider what magnificent adventure one of these ill-considered purchases may mean in the life of a family which has always had to face the dreary business of being poor. The returns in satisfaction against a setting of extreme poverty are hard to measure by those of us who live, who eat, who sleep, who bathe, who dress, who travel, all in comfort.⁶

Now let me try to make graphic for you what "a setting of extreme poverty" means. I quote first from a presentment of a Kings County Grand Jury which investigated a fire that killed seven people in Brooklyn in July 1952:

Slums are being created much faster than they are being eliminated. Overcrowding is the germ of the slum disease. Occupancy of dark, damp and filthy cellars that defy description, and families of six, seven, and more, cooking, eating and sleeping in one room lacking proper toilet and bathing facilities, are spreading the slum blight.

It is the poor who get the least and not always at the lowest price. The problem has been festering for half a century, if not longer. The evidence adduced before us disclosed that the greatest city in the world is, surely but not slowly, being permitted to deteriorate and decay.⁷

Now lest you think this is a situation peculiar to New York under the administration of an incompetent mayor, let me quote another report:

In one room twelve by twelve feet, ten people live and sleep with no sanitary facilities except a water faucet in the backyard. . . . In a four room house sixteen to twenty-five people live with no sanitary facilities Somewhere between 10 and 15 million Americans are living in such slums It is a national disgrace.⁸

This is not a report by Reds; it is the considered finding of some conservative Senators reporting to Congress in April, 1949, on an investigation they had made of some typical slums in the shadow of the Capitol dome in Washington.

Housing figures, in fact, show such bad conditions as to be unbelievable—except that they come from reputable official agencies. "At least 39 percent of city housing in the United States is below standard for minimum health and safety regulations," states the National Housing Agency. "More than 16 percent is without running water More than two-thirds has no inside private toilet."⁹

What about housing conditions in rural areas? Are they any

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

better? Not according to the National Committee on Housing which reported in 1946 that "about two million farm families live in dwellings 'beyond repair.'"¹⁰ According to 1948 data, "nearly three-quarters of all farm families had no bathtub or shower. Over one-half even lacked kitchen sinks."¹¹

It is not unfair to suggest, it seems to me, in the face of such statistics that our American "high standard of living" is a hoax. This is the way millions of American families are forced to live—and they can't even afford that. In 1950, reported the Secretary of Commerce, "the 'average city family' had outspent its income by \$400."¹²

What about our program of social security? Doesn't it help? Of course it helps—a little. But it doesn't come near meeting the needs of the lower-income groups. On April 23, 1948, Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, stated:

Reports coming into the Federal Security Agency indicate that thousands of dependent American children are undernourished to an extent bordering on starvation. Many lack the shoes and clothing needed to enable them to attend school. The plight of our aged who are no longer able to make ends meet is pitiful in the extreme.¹³

The aged, to whom Mr. Ewing refers, have become an increasing part of our population. In 1950, those over 65 years of age numbered one in every twelve. In that year when an old-age specialist promised that the average life span could be extended in the visible future to 110 or 120 years, Dr. Edwin E. Witte warned the National Conference on Aging that "longer life would mean increased poverty and misery, since one-third of those over 65 now had no incomes whatever and three-fourths [of the rest] had incomes of less than \$1,000 annually."¹⁴

What about pensions for workers provided by industrial corporations? That is becoming an important demand of labor unions. The U.S. Steel Corporation used to boast of its pensions to its "family of workers" who reached the age limit of 65. Sounds fine, doesn't it? On June 13, 1949, Philip Murray, then pressing the United Steelworkers demand for adequate pensions, revealed the emptiness of the boast. On retirement, he said, each steel worker received a letter from the corporation wishing him a "long, happy" retirement. Enclosed with the letter was the worker's first monthly pension check—exactly \$5.83.

Let it be said, however, in defense of U.S. Steel, that they were not so stingy when it came to pensions for the executives of the

MONTHLY REVIEW

company. For them, the pension system provided payments up to \$100,000 a year.¹⁵



**YOU'RE WORRIED ABOUT PEACE MEANING A BUST...?
... I'M GOING BROKE DURING YOUR BOOM!**

This contrast, incidentally, reveals one of the greatest injustices of the capitalist system. I don't know the accident rate on the job for executives in industry. But I do know it for workers—those who, in the case of steel, would be rewarded, at age 65, with a pension of \$5.83. Here are the facts: "Loss of life, and injuries within our industrial plants during the war period far exceeded the casualties on the battle fronts."¹⁶

In 1946, every half hour, for 24 hours around the clock, seven days a week, an American worker was killed on the job by accident. Every seventeen and one-half seconds, an American worker was injured.¹⁷

Unfortunately, I do not have time to give you the facts on

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

medical care or the lack of it, and the relationship between income and health. But there is a direct connection. How long you live is determined primarily by where and how you live; and where and how you live is determined by income. Here is one figure that will give you an idea: American medicine is in many respects the best in the world; yet, according to a 1948 report to the President by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, 900 people die every day "whom we have the knowledge and skills to save." That means that "every one-and-a-half minutes each day and night of every year"¹⁸ an American died, killed by a disease more terrible than any—the disease of poverty. They die because of deficient food and shelter, no money to see a doctor in time, no money to pay for the medicine they need.

I am not suggesting, of course, that there are not many people who do enjoy what is generally thought of as our "high standard of living." For those who are in the upper income bracket life can indeed be comfortable and pleasant. And for those in the topmost group in the top bracket life can be idyllic, just as it is pictured in the movies. You can see why. They have money—heaps of it. The tables below give you a good idea of how incredibly large their fortunes are. You will note, from Table C, that the highest tenth

TABLE C
Percentage of Total Money
Received By Each Tenth of
Nation's Spending Units, 1950

<i>Spending units ranked by size of income</i>	<i>Money income after Federal income tax (disposable income)</i>	
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Lowest tenth	1	1
Second	3	4
Third	5	9
Fourth	7	16
Fifth	8	24
Sixth	10	34
Seventh	11	45
Eighth	13	58
Ninth	15	73
Highest tenth	27	100

"1951 Survey of Consumer Finances,"
Reserve System. From Table 15, p. 16.

TABLE D
Proportion of Liquid Assets
Held, 1950

(Includes U.S. Gov't Bonds, savings
and checking accounts, shares in
savings and loan associations;
excludes currency)
Before taxes

<i>Percent</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
4	4
4	8
5	13
7	20
6	26
8	34
8	42
10	52
13	65
35	100

Board of Governors of the Federal
From Table 10, p. 10.

MONTHLY REVIEW

received 27 percent of total money income in 1950—an amount greater than that received by the lowest 50 percent. As regards the proportion of liquid assets they held, Table D shows that this fortunate one-tenth at the peak of the income pyramid was even better off; their 35 percent figure was *greater than the amount held by the lowest 60 percent.*

Since I do not want to be altogether gloomy on this festive occasion, let me cheer you up with a few vignettes of the lives of our really rich people. These are taken from the book *The Last Resorts* by Cleveland Amory, published last year by Harper's. Some refer to the really lush days of long ago, the others are up-to-date:

In many ways the recent story of Tuxedo Park can be summed up in the story of the last of its great estates. Known as 'Duckhollow House', a beautiful white Georgian building, directly across the lake from the club, it consists, among other things, of 25 air-conditioned rooms . . . a movie theater, a swimming pool, a life-size granite Buddha, a boathouse, an electric motorboat and thirty thousand dollars worth of shrubbery.¹⁹

More on house and grounds: At Bois Doré, "William Fahnestock hung from his trees artificial fruits which were made, like the faucets in his bathroom, of fourteen-carat gold."²⁰

And how well the animals of the rich live! "In the James pigery each pig had his own individual yard and sty."²¹

The humanity of the rich, their love—for animals—can only be admired. Thus at the O.H.P. Belmont shack in Newport: "The Belmont horses had a change of equipment morning, afternoon and evening. For the night they were bedded down on pure white linen sheets with the Belmont crest embroidered on them."²²

The rivalry between the resorts of the rich I found extremely interesting. Here, for example, is proof that Miami Beach has it all over Palm Beach: "Along Lincoln Road which is called 'The Most Beautiful Shopping Lane in the World' . . . it is possible to spend fifteen hundred dollars on a necktie, a difficult task in Palm Beach."²³

But don't think, please, that the rich do not have their troubles. They do. Money worries—just like the rest of us. "In the summer of 1952, Charles Merrill, senior partner of New York's largest brokerage firm, Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, declared in court that though he estimated his worth at \$5,000,000 he could no longer afford his third Palm Beach wife. She spent, he said in his suit for divorce, \$360,000 a year."²⁴

Mr. Merrill, you will agree, had a good case. His wife was spending roughly \$1,000 a day. That, you will recall, is the amount

THAT "HIGH" AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING

which one out of every nine American families had to eat, drink, and be merry on, *for the entire year*.

Those of you who are dwelling in cramped living quarters, may not have seen the ad in the *New York Times* of July 12, 1953, describing a 49-acre estate in the Greenwich area of Connecticut, now, happily for you, on the market. If this charming house and grounds does not present a solution to your problem, then you are indeed hard to please. It includes, in addition to "two miles of private waterfront," the following:

1. An outdoor floodlighted theatre.
 2. Four formal gardens, including floodlit fountains and a replica of famous Garden of Versailles.
 3. A ballroom with a maple floor balanced on springs.
 4. 2½ miles of automobile road.
 5. Aeolian organ in 30-foot domed reception hall.
- Setting the tone of the interior is the lavish use of gold leaf and marble for decoration, as well as the gold fittings and Wedgewood inlays in the master bath. Built in 1914, with absolutely no regard for expense, the entire property has been continuously maintained and modernized.
 - The exquisite gardens were landscaped and have been maintained by experts. Four formal gardens in all. Hundreds of pink and white dogwood trees and a profusion of shrubs and flowers.
 - The main residence has six master bedrooms. Also on the property is a 14 room superintendent's cottage, an additional 5 room cottage, large greenhouse, stone coach house, and an 8 car garage.
 - Despite the sumptuous nature of the house and grounds, it is possible to maintain the entire property, inside and out, with ten in help.

If desired, furnishings are available at \$100,000.*

The United States, like every capitalist country, is in reality two nations. One, those who work—without living; the other, those who live—without working. For the one the "high standard of living" is a fraud; for the other the standard of living is not high—it is so disgustingly vulgar as to be degrading.

This state of affairs is not just a happen-so; it was not true of 1950 alone; it is true today; it will be true in 1980 too—if we still have capitalism. But we *can* abolish slow starvation, insecurity, "the dreary business of being poor." We *can* produce and distribute all

*This section, concerning the estate for sale in Connecticut, has been added to the original talk.

MONTHLY REVIEW

the things our people need to make life worth living. In short, we can make the American high standard of living a reality. We can do it, however, in only one way—by supplanting capitalism with socialism.

Five years ago we started *Monthly Review* to help bring about that change. We are still dedicated to that task.

1 Cf. "Supporting Data for Statement of Russ Nixon, Washington representative, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE), On Proposals Pending Before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, March 11, 1953," p. 2.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 1, 2. See also Gunther Stein, *The World The Dollar Built*, London, 1952, pp. 149, 150.

3 Stein, *op. cit.* p. 192.

4 *Ibid.*

5 *Ibid.*, p. 210.

6 *Making Ends Meet On Less Than \$2000 A Year*, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, 82d Congress, 1st Session, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1951.

7 *Presentment of a Kings County Grand Jury on Slums in Brooklyn*, July, 1952.

8 Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

9 *Ibid.*

10 *Ibid.*

11 *Ibid.*

12 *Ibid.*, p. 204.

13 Federal Security Agency, Mimeographed Advance Release, April 23, 1948, p. 1.

14 Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 206.

16 "Report of President Philip Murray," in *Proceedings, Eighth Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations*, 1946, p. 89.

17 *Ibid.*

18 Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

19 Cleveland Amory, *The Last Resorts*, New York, 1952, p. 105.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 176.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 177.

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 177, 178.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 369.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 359.

There's always room at the bottom.—Lincoln Steffens.

REFLECTIONS ON JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS

BY PAUL M. SWEETZ

The end of the Korean War raises crucial questions for both Japan and the United States, including one which involves them both equally—what is to be the future of relations between our two countries?

To study this question in all its aspects would require many volumes. If, therefore, we are to discuss it intelligently in a few pages, we can do so only on the basis of certain far-reaching assumptions—assumptions which can and should be made explicit but which cannot be proved or justified. What I am assuming in this article, put as briefly as possible, is as follows:

First, that the choice before the American ruling class is either continuation of the present policy of seeking to "liberate" the peoples of the socialist countries from their present regimes (in practice, this is equivalent to seeking world hegemony for the United States), or recognition of the inevitability of coexistence of capitalism and socialism for a considerable period (in practice, this would mean willingness to settle international issues on a give-and-take basis of conciliation and compromise).

Second, that for reasons of geography, population, and availability of natural resources, Japan must choose between three courses in international affairs: (1) Imperialist conquest and exploitation of accessible Asian and Pacific countries. For convenience let us call this "imperialism." (2) Dependence on United States subsidies, which in turn implies accepting the position of an American satellite. Let us call this "subsidies." (3) Adaptation of the Japanese economy to the requirements of potential trading partners, chief of which must be Japan's neighbors on the Asian mainland and particularly China. Let us call this "trade with China."

In what follows, I should like to consider some of the ways in which the United States and Japan, faced with the choices I have indicated, can be expected to, or could conceivably, react on each other in the years ahead.

It is clear that in the past the Japanese ruling class attempted to

This article was written for the October issue of the Japanese magazine Sekai, a special number devoted to "the new crisis facing Japan." It is being printed simultaneously in MR with the permission of the editors of Sekai.

solve Japan's problems by imperialism, and that this course led to Japanese involvement in World War II and to complete military defeat. As a result of this defeat, Japan was occupied by American armed forces and was forced, willy nilly, to rely on subsidies. The end of the Korean War now raises the question whether Japan can continue in the future to rely on subsidies, and if so on what terms.

For the last three years, the major part of the subsidies which have kept the Japanese economy going have been indirect, that is to say, they have taken the form of dollar payments for goods and services provided to the United States forces for carrying on the war in Korea. Korean reconstruction may provide a breathing space, but fundamentally this arrangement must now be considered to have come to an end.

What is to take its place? One thing is certain, it will not be simple economic aid of the Marshall Plan variety. Even in Europe, the American ruling class has had enough of Marshall Plans, and there is not the slightest chance that anything of the kind will be instituted in Asia on a scale which would be required to make a dent on Japan's economic problems. Clearly, if Japan is to continue to live on subsidies she must fall into line with America's world policy and apply herself diligently to playing the part assigned to her. What that role is, was recently described as follows by Hanson W. Baldwin, the well informed and influential military expert for the *New York Times*:

... our strategists view Japan as the Pacific's Germany. In other words, the rearmament of Japan and her re-emergence as a great non-Communist power is essential to checking the expansion of Soviet Communism in Asia and to providing the balance of power in the Western Pacific (which the United States has hitherto largely provided). (*New York Times*, June 21, 1953.)

It follows that in order to continue to earn subsidies, Japan must rearm against her largest and most powerful neighbors. Ultimately, however, the purpose of American policy is not merely "checking the expansion" of Communism; it is the overthrow of the present regime in China. It is well to remind ourselves that this purpose has been specifically avowed by the present Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, on more than one occasion. For example, in testifying on the Japanese Peace Treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in January 1952, Mr. Dulles made the following statements:

[It is] a sound assumption . . . that the present situation on the [Asian] mainland must be changed. . . . In other words, we must and can assume that there will be a change from the pres-

REFLECTIONS ON JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS

ent China situation which now compels the free nations temporarily to restrict closely their economic relations with the mainland of China. . . . It would be, in my opinion, a wrong and a defeatist policy to assume that these conditions which exist in China today are in China forever. I do not believe they are there forever. I think they are going to change.

Ultimately, therefore, if Japan is to continue living on subsidies, she will have not only to rearm against her neighbors but actually to become the spearhead of America's counter-revolutionary crusade in Asia. Imperialism led to one attempt to conquer China. Subsidies are leading to another, with this difference, that on the second attempt, if it materializes, Japan will be acting not independently but as the instrument of United States policy.

If this reasoning is sound, subsidies are not really the alternative to imperialism that they may at first sight appear to be. Both lead to wars of intervention and conquest on the mainland of Asia, and experience shows that this is Japan's road to national disaster.

I conclude that Japan's only real hope for the future is trade with China, that is to say, the adaptation of the Japanese economy to the requirements of continuously expanding trade with her neighbors. It would be foolish to overlook or underestimate the difficulties of this course. It is not simply a question of abolishing legal restrictions on trade and allowing market forces to do the rest. China is a genuinely planned economy, and the long-run coordination of the economies of Japan and China would imply that Japan must also adopt a large degree of economic planning. Moreover, supplying what China will need in the years ahead would almost certainly mean far-reaching changes in the pattern of Japanese economic life. Reforms and adjustments of such magnitude must of course encounter obstacles. But the important thing to keep in mind is that these obstacles can all be surmounted: Japan's salvation would seem to lie in frankly recognizing their existence and resolutely seeking the means of overcoming them.

At this point, however, we must ask what would be the effect on Japanese-American relations if Japan should choose to follow a policy of economic partnership with China. The American ruling class would, of course, regard such a development with extreme disfavor and would do everything practicable to prevent its occurrence. We should have to expect a combination of threats and bribes which could hardly help having powerful effects on the Japanese ruling class. The possibility that United States armed forces stationed in Japan would be used to interfere directly in Japanese internal affairs is not even to be excluded. If, nevertheless, Japan should firmly reject the policy of subsidies and persist in following the course of trade

with China, there can be no doubt that at least for a time the United States would become hostile to Japan and do everything within its power to injure Japanese interests.

I do not believe, however, that this worsening of relations between our two countries would necessarily be permanent. I believe that it could be temporary and, even more important, that it might turn out to be the disagreeable but unavoidable prelude to a new period of friendship, mutual respect, and economic cooperation.

To see why this is possible, we must turn our attention for a moment to United States policy. As indicated above, the aim of American policy is—and has been at least since the enunciation of the Truman Doctrine in 1947*—to “liberate” the peoples of the socialist countries from their present regimes, which would imply surrender of the latter to American dictates and hence for all practical purposes American world domination. Clearly, such a policy makes sense only if the United States either has or expects to be able to acquire the superior military force necessary to back it up.

There was a time when American policymakers were counting on atomic weapons to give them this military superiority, but now that the Soviet Union has both A-bombs and H-bombs any such calculation is obviously illusory. Similarly, the experience of the Korean War has demonstrated the fallacy of “victory through airpower,” and it was always apparent that because of geographical factors the socialist bloc is relatively immune to naval power.

Decisive military strength, therefore, lies in ground forces, which, unfortunately for the American ruling class, happens to be the field in which the USSR and China enjoy the greatest natural superiority over the United States. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that no conceivable arms program or military strategy could ever suffice to give the United States, relying on its own resources, the military supremacy which alone could make “liberation” a realistic goal of foreign policy. If in spite of this the American ruling class still clings to the policy of “liberation,” as all available evidence indicates that it does, this can only mean that it is counting on others to supply the ground forces which, in conjunction with United States air and naval

* It is often argued, at least in the United States, that the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration differs radically from that of its predecessor—that whereas Truman and Acheson stood for “containment,” Eisenhower and Dulles stand for “liberation.” It is true that this difference does exist at the verbal level, but it hardly goes deeper. As far as content is concerned, no policy pronouncements of the Eisenhower administration have been more uncompromisingly “liberationist” than Acheson’s famous seven-points speech delivered at Berkeley, California, on March 16, 1950. Nor did Acheson’s seven points represent a change of policy: they were merely an explicit formulation of what had been American policy almost from the day of Roosevelt’s death.

REFLECTIONS ON JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS

power, would provide the necessary margin of military superiority. And it is hardly a secret that Germany and Japan have been selected as the only countries able and potentially willing to make this crucially important contribution to the success of American plans. To quote again from Hanson W. Baldwin:

We must hold both Asia and Europe, and the keys today—the absolutely indispensable foci of our military, political and economic strategy—are Germany and Japan. ("Europe or Asia—Priority for Which?", *New York Times Magazine*, August 15, 1953, p. 52. Second emphasis added.)

Now if this is true, I do not see how it can be denied that any fundamental change in Japanese policy such as would be involved in Japan's rejecting subsidies and choosing trade with China must have the most far-reaching repercussions on American ruling-class thinking and ultimately on United States policy. A change of this kind in Japanese policy would shatter forever the dream of American domination over Asia, since in the final analysis that dream is based on Japanese armies. And if the American ruling class were once convinced that its present policy of "liberation" is simply beyond its capacity to carry out, would not a shift in the direction of "live and let live" be bound to set in sooner or later?

This shift toward a more peaceful policy would not of course be unopposed within the American ruling class. Years of Cold War have already built up powerful vested interests in the continuation, and if need be the accentuation, of international tensions. An important part of Big Business is crucially interested in armaments, and almost the whole ruling class fears that a drastic reduction of military spending would lead back to the economic stagnation of the thirties. The generals and admirals are more numerous and more powerful than they have ever been before. Promising political careers—Senator McCarthy's is the leading example—have been built upon the fears arising out of the Cold War. All of these factors and forces will unite in opposing a basic reorientation of American policy, will insist that if necessary the United States can and should "go it alone" in opposition to the socialist world.

It would be a great mistake to underestimate the strength of these go-it-alone forces. It may be that whatever happens in the rest of the world they will win the day in the United States. And yet it would be no less a mistake to assume that they are certain to win out. We simply cannot know as long as the real go-it-aloners are allied with those who still hope to win the Cold (or Hot) War with the assistance of hundreds of German and Japanese divisions. If and when that hope is shattered, but I believe not until then, we shall

MONTHLY REVIEW

find out whether the American ruling class as a whole is still capable of drawing back before it is too late, or whether it has already embarked irrevocably on the road to disaster.

Nothing, I think, could do so much to dispel the American ruling class's hope of effective outside military assistance as a decision on the part of Japan to seek her own salvation through a policy of peaceful cooperation with her neighbors. If I am right about this, it follows that nothing could contribute more powerfully to a basic reorientation of American policy away from "liberation" and toward peaceful coexistence. And in an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, there is no reason why relations between Japan and the United States could not be developed on a basis of mutual respect and advantage, in accordance with the real needs of the Japanese and American peoples.

It is paradoxical, but I think profoundly true, that Japan now has it in her power to serve both her own national interest and the national interest of the United States (as distinct from the selfish and ultimately self-defeating interest of part of the American ruling class) by simply declining further American subsidies and deciding to adapt her economy to the requirements of the natural economic region of which she forms a part. Note that this policy would not involve refusing economic relations with the United States; it would simply involve taking up economic relations with neighbors who must in the long run also be friends if Japan is to survive and prosper. It would *not* involve fighting against the United States; it would simply involve refusing to fight, at the behest of the United States, against anyone else.

Of course, those in Japan who advocate such a policy will be abused and reviled on both sides of the Pacific, by both Japanese and American spokesmen for the American ruling-class point of view. In particular, they will be called anti-American, and some of them may honestly believe that they are anti-American. But let them not be deterred or deceived. Those of us in the United States who recognize the true interests of the American people know that they are in fact the best friends of America, the real *pro-Americans*. The stronger they are, the stronger we shall become until at long last our two countries can meet as equals in a spirit of trust and friendship.

Would not the Japanese peace treaty be more in line with Asian realities, and hence more likely to represent a permanent settlement, if her most powerful and influential neighbors, China and the Soviet Union, had been included in the negotiations from the beginning?

—*Steps To Peace*, American Friends Service Committee

THE TREASON OF THE SENATE

BY HARVEY O'CONNOR

There was nothing inevitable about the conquest of the United States by General Motors, General Electric, Standard Oil, U. S. Steel, et al. Back in 1906, it was so far from a foregone conclusion that:

(1) The corporations openly bought seats in the United States Senate.

(2) Their Senators killed legislation aimed at monopoly.

(3) To describe this business, an eminent journalist used the epithet, "The Treason of the Senate."

(4) A leading mass-circulation magazine, the *Cosmopolitan*, not merely dared, but rejoiced to publish the damning indictment of the Senate by David Graham Phillips; moreover, it sold out issue after issue that carried his scathing stories.

The conquest is now an accomplished fact. The corporations no longer need buy seats in the Senate (although seats in the Cabinet still seem to be needed to assure direct as well as remote control). The peril to monopoly now is so far removed that it is proposed to emasculate the out-moded antitrust laws. Monopoly is about to become legal in theory as well as in fact.

But if a writer of Phillips' stature should size up the present-day treason of the Senate, to what magazine could he turn? So complete is the conquest of the United States by the corporations that perhaps no outstanding writer today would even waste his time preparing the copy, knowing full well that no magazine or newspaper would touch it. To name names, to label treason against the people for what it is, would now be considered an attack on "the American way of life"; the full fury of the Veldes, Jenners, and McCarthys would be poured upon the hapless writer and his publisher; the writer would go to jail for "contempt" of the Senate and the publisher be ruined.

So—if no one now can or will tackle the job, all the more credit to Monthly Review Press for republishing Phillips' glowing words in

This is a review by Harvey O'Connor, who is currently having his own trouble with the Senate, of David Graham Phillips' *The Treason of the Senate*, which will be published on October 15 by Monthly Review Press. *The Treason of the Senate* is a collection of articles, here for the first time brought together in book form, which ran in *Cosmopolitan Magazine* from March through November, 1906. For money-saving offers (the book will be priced at \$4.75), see page 286. For latest news on the case of Harvey O'Connor vs Joe McCarthy et al, see Notes from the Editors.

MONTHLY REVIEW

The Treason of the Senate. In his day, Phillips described how the United States was being sold down the river by corporation hirelings, and the story was only of national concern. Now, when the people of half the world are being sold down the river by the Senate and its allies, republication of the book has international significance. This book describes, Senator by Senator, how the filthy job was done back in the early 1900s. Chauncey Depew, the Senator owned body and breeches by the Vanderbilts of New York Central, cost the American people "at least one billion dollars," Phillips charged. What chicken feed! In the Senate today, how lucky would we be if a Senator only cost us a billion!

And it is not merely a matter of billions, either. Billions of dollars can come and they can go. Freedom, a more precious commodity, can be bartered away and lost. Freedom of expression, for instance. Turn to Phillips' pages, and then ask yourself who today could write and who could publish words like these:

... the Senate is the eager, resourceful, indefatigable agent of interests as hostile to the American people as any invading army could be, and vastly more dangerous; interests that manipulate the prosperity produced by all, so that it heaps up riches for the few; interests whose growth and power can only mean the degradation of the people, of the educated into sycophants, of the masses toward serfdom. (P. 6.)

What clairvoyance! How, 47 years ago, could Phillips have foreseen the neat conquest by the corporations not only of the nation's material resources but of its people as well—the millions fascinated by the flood of delectable poison pouring out of all the TVs and the radios, reducing their minds to mash and their wills to jelly, all by courtesy of GE, GM, and the rest of our entertaining masters?

In those days, even the political bosses were frank. Roscoe Conkling, an old hand in New York politics, was asked about Chauncey Depew. "Depew? You mean the fellow Vanderbilt sends to Albany every winter to say 'gee' and 'haw' to his cattle there?" (P. 15.)

And there was Nelson W. Aldrich, Senator from Rhode Island, father-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., whose name is perpetuated in Nelson Rockefeller, in Winthrop W. Aldrich, yesterday head of Chase National and today Ambassador to Britain, and in many another scion of our ruling class. Of Senator Aldrich, Phillips wrote:

No, intellect is not the characteristic of Aldrich—or of any of these traitors, or of the men they serve. A scurvy lot they are, are they not, with their smirking and cringing and voluble palaver about God and patriotism and their eager offerings of endowments for hospitals and colleges whenever the American people so much as looks hard in their direction! (P. 31.)

THE TREASON OF THE SENATE

Hard, striking words, these, that go to the mark, tearing away the sanctified sham and fake majesty that the press and radio today clothe our Caesars in. What would not a David Graham Phillips have done with our Charles E. Wilsons, our Harry Trumans, our Dwight Eisenhowers, our Robert A. Tafts!

Nor was Phillips merely concerned about exposing personal treachery in the Senate. It was not just a matter of servile hirelings catering to their masters.

. . . the great, vital, all-dominating, all-dwarfing issue, has been justice in the distribution of wealth—the product of a man's labor to the man himself. The politicians, serving the plunderers and diverters of the people's property and prosperity, have been trying, often successfully, to obscure or to pervert this issue. (P. 51.)

Now it can be said, they succeeded only too well. The issue has been obscured, until today the high priests of capitalism assert that not only can no economic problem of concern be seen by the people, but there is no such problem whatsoever. Once again we are on the ever-ascending plateau of prosperity, guided by our betters, and there is nothing for us to worry about so long as our factories grind out their deadly grist of bigger and faster bombers, bigger and faster tanks and guns; or so long as these machines mound up the dead ever higher in the rice paddies of Korea and Indo-China. No problem whatsoever!

For his pains, Phillips was denounced as a "muck-raker" by no less a person than President Theodore Roosevelt. And small wonder, for what muck there was, and is, to be raked! Witness Phillips' words:

But in a Senate of Knoxes and Elkinses, of Aldriches, Depews, Baileys, Burtons, Spooners, and Platts, the only problems that concern the "statesmen" are how to keep the people docile under saddle and curb, and how to maintain the plutocracy in the saddle, hand on the curb-rein.

Admit that it is "muck-raking" to write and publish the records of the senators as made by themselves. Still, how does the epithet "muck-raker" change the fact of senatorial treason to the people, incessant, flagrant, deliberate? How does it change the fact that the Senate is licensing and protecting the sneak-thieves that pilfer daily, hourly, from your wages, your savings, your till, your larder, your coal bin? (P. 71.)

For his brave words, Phillips was crucified. The distinguished author of novels such as *Susan Lenox* was all but excluded from the magazines after *The Treason of the Senate* was published, and his subsequent books were neglected by the critics. Nor did he live to

MONTHLY REVIEW

see the Constitution amended in 1913 to provide for direct election of Senators.

It was just as well, perhaps. Had he written *The Treason of the Senate* in 1953, his comments on that august body would have been penalized by 12 months in the penitentiary—the maximum sentence for “contempt of the Senate.”

*Mr. McCarthy considers it wise
To act as if we all were spies;
The problem is: if this were true,
You'd shoot me, but who'd shoot you?*

—F. D. Reeve

In this play I have represented one of the Roman persecutions of the early Christians, not as the conflict of a false theology with a true, but as what all such persecutions essentially are: an attempt to suppress a propaganda that seemed to threaten the interests involved in the established law and order, organized and maintained in the name of religion and justice by politicians who are pure opportunist Have-and-Holders. People who are shewn by their inner light the possibility of a better world based on the demand of the spirit for a nobler and more abundant life, not for themselves at the expense of others, but for everybody, are naturally dreaded and therefore hated by the Have-and-Holders, who keep always in reserve two sure weapons against them. The first is a persecution effected by the provocation, organization, and arming of that herd instinct which makes men abhor all departures from custom, and, by the most cruel punishments and the wildest calumnies, force eccentric people to behave and profess exactly as other people do. The second is by leading the herd to war, which immediately and infallibly makes them forget everything, even their most cherished and hardwon public liberties and private interests, in the irresistible surge of their pugnacity and the tense pre-occupation of their terror.

Therefore my martyrs are the martyrs of all time, and my persecutors the persecutors of all time.

—George Bernard Shaw, *Androcles and the Lion*

MALENKOV'S SECRET WEAPON

BY A STUDENT OF THE USSR

Soviet Premier Malenkov's speech of August 8, 1953, created somewhat of a stir in the nonsocialist world. But as is so often the case, the real importance of the speech seems to have been largely overlooked by the bourgeois press.

The announcement that the United States no longer has a monopoly in the production of H-bombs should shatter the illusions of those diehards who maintain that capitalism can be saved by resort to secret weapons. It remains to be seen, however, whether these individuals will open their eyes to the current capabilities of Soviet technology, or whether they will follow the more familiar ritualistic pattern of seeking the "traitors who gave away the bomb."

Those of us who already recognize the high level of Soviet technology can more profitably spend our time analyzing the remainder of this important speech in the light of Soviet postwar economic development.

To what extent does Malenkov's speech on the economic state of the nation represent a continuation of Stalinist policy? To what extent does the Malenkov program appear to be a modification of earlier economic policy? To answer these questions it is necessary first to look at the postwar economic development policy pursued by the Soviet Union, as well as the results achieved.

To an important degree, Soviet economic development in the postwar years has followed lines laid down in Stalin's speech of February 9, 1946. In this speech Stalin set forth Soviet long-range goals for the annual production of pig iron, steel, coal, and oil.

These production goals are declared to be necessary (1) to protect the heartland of socialism from "all unforeseen incidents"; and (2) to insure the complete economic victory of the Soviet Union. In other words, this proposed level of output would protect the USSR from foreign attack as well as insure the successful transition from socialism to communism.

At the same time, Stalin estimated that a minimum of three Five-Year Plans would be required to reach these goals. Thus, the

The author, an economist specializing on the Soviet economy, is a regular contributor to MR. His most recent article was "Workers' Incomes in the Soviet Union," MR, November 1952.

MONTHLY REVIEW

Soviet Union was not expected to attain these production levels until 1960 at the earliest. Now we are roughly half way through the minimum time period set by Stalin. The first postwar Five Year Plan—Plan IV, which covered 1946-1950—has been successfully completed, and the Soviet Union is approximately at the midpoint of Plan V (1951-1955).

A comparison of Stalin's long-range goals with Malenkov's estimate of 1953 output is presented in the accompanying table. The planned targets for 1955 are also included. On the basis of these

CURRENT AND PLANNED OUTPUT OF BASIC PRODUCER GOODS, SOCIALIST AND CAPITALIST BLOCS*

	<i>Coal</i>	<i>Petroleum</i>	<i>Electricity**</i>	<i>Steel</i>	<i>Pig Iron**</i>
1. Stalin's Long-range Goals, circa 1960	500	60	250	60	50
2. USSR 1953 Output (approx.)	320	52	133	38	28
3. USSR 1955 Planned Output	372	69.9	162.6	44.2	34.1
4. Eastern Europe 1952 Output***	155	10	55	11	5.5
5. Eastern Europe 1955 Planned Output	218	16	82	16.5	11.5
6. Total USSR and Eastern Europe Output 1952-53	475	62	188	49	33.5
7. Total USSR and Eastern Europe 1955 Planned Output	590	85.9	244.6	60.7	45.6
8. Western Europe 1952 Output	469	56	208	53 *	36
9. USA 1952 Output	456.1	313.9	462.6	84.5	60

* Unit of measure: million metric tons except for electricity, which is billion kilowatt hours.

** The long range goal for pig iron was first mentioned as early as the 18th Party Congress in 1939, while the goal for electricity was not divulged until 1951.

*** The total for Eastern Europe includes data for the German Democratic Republic.

data, it would seem that Stalin was rather conservative in setting the period required to attain the long-term goals. The long-range target for petroleum, for example, is scheduled to be reached in 1955. Furthermore, given the current rate of growth, the other basic goals should be attained by 1960 at the very latest.

Since 1946, the socialist-oriented areas of the world have increased considerably. Important sections of Eastern Europe and Asia have joined the Soviet camp. Many of these areas are developing their own basic industries at a rapid pace, and their output should be added to Soviet production, at least for purposes of determining the socialist defense potential.

Estimated Eastern European production for 1952, as well as the approximate targets for 1955, is also given in the preceding table. When these quantities are added to the Soviet totals, it can be seen that Stalin's long-range goals for coal and oil should be reached either this year or next; the targets for steel and electricity should be attained in 1955; and the goal for pig iron a year later. In other words, the socialist world must already be very nearly secure from "unforeseen incidents."

There has also been an expansion of the basic raw materials produced in the West since 1946, although this growth is by no means as impressive as that achieved in the socialist areas. And what is more important, currently the expansion in the West appears to be coming to a halt, while Soviet production rolls merrily along. At present, total socialist production of the basic producer goods is roughly equivalent to the combined 1952 output of Western Europe, including France, Italy, West Germany, Britain, and the Low Countries. Furthermore, unless something is done to remedy the capitalist economic treadmill, socialist production is scheduled to overtake and surpass Western Europe by 1955, as can be seen from data also presented in the preceding table.

United States output in 1952 was roughly one and one-half times larger than either the combined socialist output planned for 1955 or aggregate Western European production in 1952. But in the United States, too, the rate of growth appears to be slackening and it seems probable that our total output will actually dip before 1955.

In view of the growth in the West since 1946, is it possible that Stalin's long-range goals, set in 1946, are no longer adequate to protect the heartland of socialism? While these goals would seem inadequate to support an *offensive*, they should be more than sufficient for *defensive* purposes. In this connection, it might be pertinent to mention that Japan put up a stubborn defense in World War II with a peak steel output of less than 8 million tons (or about one-sixth

MONTHLY REVIEW

of the current output of the socialist bloc) and of course without any A-bombs or H-bombs.

This relatively secure defensive position of the socialist world is undoubtedly an important factor behind the recent events which Western spokesmen call the "Soviet peace offensive." While Stalin's death undoubtedly accelerated the introduction of certain domestic reforms within the socialist world, the basic drive for a rapprochement with the West was evident long before Stalin's death, and what the Malenkov regime has done represents essentially a continuation of this policy. Certainly there are no grounds for supposing that the recent Soviet moves represent a fearful response to Secretary of State Dulles' strong words.

Now that the socialist world approaches a position more or less secure from "unforeseen incidents," some slowing down of the rate of industrial expansion might be expected. In my opinion, however, it is unlikely that any drastic deceleration in the rate of basic industrial growth will occur, even after 1955. For although current production of the socialist world is generally adequate for defense purposes, it is still a good way short of the level required for the transition from socialism to communism.

The production goals required for the transition from socialism to communism are closely related to *per capita output*, and here the socialist world still lags considerably behind the West. Per capita production of the basic raw materials is at present approaching that of France; but it is still considerably below that attained in the United States even as far back as 1929, the last year when our capacity to produce was reasonably fully utilized for peaceful purposes.

This lagging of per capita output explains why it is difficult to depict the current Plan V (at least in its Stalinist draft version) as representing any substantial transfer of resources from basic industries to consumer goods industries. Plan IV *did* give priority to consumer goods, since it was imperative that the low standard of living resulting from World War II be raised. Now that the Soviet standard of living is considerably above the prewar level, however, it becomes possible to pursue Stalin's long-range goals at a faster pace. In absolute physical quantities, the draft of Plan V provided for increases of consumer goods which are about the same as those achieved during Plan IV. At the same time, the physical quantitative increases for basic industrial goods considerably exceed those of Plan IV.

It is true that the Malenkov administration has now decided to accelerate consumer goods production, and this may modify the initial Stalinist draft of Plan V somewhat. According to Malenkov's speech, the Soviet Union's consumer goods industries possess the capabilities

MALENKOV'S SECRET WEAPON

for fulfilling their 1955 targets in 1954. If this is carried out, it means that the producer and consumer goods industries will be expanding at about the same rate.

The main levers by which it is hoped to achieve this early fulfillment of consumer goods goals are important concessions to agricultural interests. Higher farm delivery prices and lower taxes on individual agricultural enterprise are expected to spur the farmers on to greater activity. It is also possible that those released from custody under the recent amnesty may act as a reservoir of labor to increase durable consumer goods production. But nowhere is there any mention in Malenkov's speech of any cutbacks in heavy industry or in the impressive projects for "transforming nature."

An important reason for this continued emphasis on heavy industry is in all probability the role which the Soviet Union is increasingly playing in Asia. Whereas the countries of Eastern Europe are capable of industrializing themselves, with only the assistance of Soviet technical know-how, the socialist-oriented areas of Asia currently produce a relatively insignificant amount of the basic producer goods and stand to benefit greatly from capital imports from the USSR. The recently concluded trade agreement between the Soviet Union and China is undoubtedly only the forerunner of larger capital exports by the USSR. This capital is exported in the form of machinery; and, according to Chinese spokesmen, the prices of Soviet equipment are from 20 to 30 percent lower than the prices of comparable equipment from capitalist countries. Furthermore, to the extent that the capital is loaned, the interest rate charges are no more than nominal.

Despite the continued emphasis on the development of heavy industry, substantial improvements in living standards were promised by the Stalinist draft version of Plan V. In contrast to some of the earlier plans, the consumption goals were being currently fulfilled with greater fidelity even before the Malenkov revisions.

In addition to the consumption goals for 1955, we now have a progress report on the first two years of Plan V, 1951 and 1952. Below I have summarized the planned percentage increase in the retail sales by state and cooperative trade outlets of 12 important consumer goods from 1951 to 1955. I have also computed the increase in sales of these same goods during the first two years of the plan.

It seems evident that sales of most products are rising at a rate sufficient to fulfill the targets originally set for 1955, targets which will mean an overall increase of 70 percent in retail turnover during the planning period. Most sales are already rising at a rate slightly faster than that necessary to fulfill the planned 1955 sales; a few are

MONTHLY REVIEW

only slightly behind schedule.

Commodity	Actual % Increase 1952 Sales over 1950	Planned % Increase 1955 Sales over 1950
1. meat	45	90
2. fish products	29	70
3. butter	29	70
4. vegetable oil	64	100
5. milk and milk products	58	150-200
6. sugar	62	100
7. silk fabrics	51	70
8. leather shoes	28	80
9. sewing machines	57	140
10. watches and clocks	38	120
11. furniture	80	200
12. bicycles	131	250

For the first time a Five Year Plan specifies that the chief means for increasing real wages will be a continuation of the annual price reductions, the latest of which occurred in April 1953. Earlier Five Year Plans specified the planned increase in terms of money wages. Although money wages may rise somewhat during Plan V, just as they have risen since the initiation of the annual price reductions in 1948, the lowering of retail prices will doubtless be the chief means by which the real wages of workers will be increased by 35 percent during the five-year period. While it stands to reason that these gains might be even greater should East-West tension be reduced, they are probably substantial enough to convince the Soviet workers that communist (or free) distribution will eventually result from this deflationary price policy. Furthermore, while unrationed 11c bread (lb.), 60c beef (lb.), and 3.5c potatoes (lb.)* may not appeal especially to the average American consumer, these inexpensive current prices for food can hardly help having a strong emotional appeal to the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial world, or even to those of Western Europe.

Approximately two years ago, I concluded tentatively that the potentialities for producing guns and butter were considerably greater in the Soviet Union than they were in the United States or Great Britain. Since then, the Soviet economy has proven to be a formidable military competitor with the West. But it has been an even more

* Dollar equivalent prices in my article, "Workers' Incomes in the Soviet Union," *MR* November, 1952, reduced by percentage reductions effective April 1, 1953.

MALENKOV'S SECRET WEAPON

formidable competitor in raising living standards. Whereas western living standards have virtually stagnated, Soviet consumption has increased by leaps and bounds.

How the Western countries are to meet this competition in the future presents a considerable dilemma to the powers that be. For in the words of Sumner Slichter: "In the cold war this country must have guns *and* butter. The guns are necessary to discourage aggression, and the butter is necessary to keep the people satisfied with our institutions." ("Are We Headed for a Depression?" *Harper's*, February 1953, p. 30.)

The ruling class has a choice. It can follow the Eisenhower administration's present policy of stretching out the military build-up and *hoping* that consumption will rise. But unfortunately stagnation in the consumer goods industries is not the result of too much military expenditures. Rather it is caused by the fact that the market for even present consumer goods production is rapidly dwindling, despite the fact that the current rate of production is considerably below capacity levels. The end result of a stretchout policy can only be a rise in unemployment and a falling off of overall consumption.

Or the ruling class can return to the Keynesian-Democratic formula of continually increasing military appropriations. This would provide a mask for unemployment, but would entail a rapidly rising national debt and probably a return to inflation. Since military expenditures do not contribute to a rising standard of living, consumption would of course also continue to stagnate if this course were pursued.

For the time being, it looks as if the first course of action will be attempted if only because the Democrats have already tried the second course to no avail. Unemployment may be expected to rise, but a little more unemployment would be a good thing from the standpoint of business since the bargaining power of labor falls as unemployment rises.

In the long run, certainly, nothing but a radical change in our capitalist institutions is capable of remedying our stagnating consumption. Even a fascist solution can never provide a satisfactory answer since inefficiencies of capitalism are frozen along with the productive relationships. While a fascist economy could presumably match the Soviet economy on military grounds, it could never produce what may turn out to be the all-deciding "secret weapon." The properties of this weapon are falling prices and rising personal consumption; the "secret formula" is production for use rather than for highest profits; the magical label bears the inscription *socialism*.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

By Arthur Eggleston

LABOR UNITY IN SIGHT AT LAST?

For seventeen years all efforts to reunite AFL and CIO have failed. Four specific attempts got nowhere, resulting merely in caustic exchanges assessing the blame for the breakdown. Finally, merger efforts sank to the level of perfunctory gestures. The latest episode in this old order of things took place at the September, 1952, AFL convention in New York City, with the late William Green presiding. True, there was a brief flurry of interest when John L. Lewis, *bête noir* of top AFL and CIO leaders and head of the United Mine Workers, sent a message urging that all labor organizations march into a united federation within thirty days and settle jurisdictional problems later. But the only result of this unrealistic proposal was a rehashing of old complaints against Lewis and the CIO for the breakdown of unity talks, a general pouring of scorn on Lewis, and an announcement, not taken seriously, that the AFL was prepared to resume negotiations with the CIO.

Then, in rapid-fire order, came important events that transformed the labor outlook. In November, the Republicans ended the 20-year role of the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal. Spokesmen for industry and management boasted openly of what was going to happen to labor and New Deal reforms. Next, CIO President Philip Murray died on November 9, precipitating a struggle between United Automobile Workers' Walter P. Reuther and United Steelworkers' David McDonald. Uncertainty as to the fate of the CIO was far from dissipated by the election of Reuther to the top CIO job.

The end of a familiar era in the labor movement seemed truly at hand when William Green, AFL President since 1924, died on November 21. George Meany, brought into the AFL national office as executive secretary over a decade ago to become Green's successor, was immediately elected President. Almost his first official act was to invite the CIO to make another attempt at "organic" unity.

Surprising developments followed. Gradually it became apparent that the old order had really changed, that proposals for labor unity were not merely gestures to be made at suitable intervals in the in-

terests of good public relations. In February of this year, the AFL executive council voted to reopen talks with the CIO. Committees were appointed, met in April, and announced that subcommittees would immediately begin study of the structure and jurisdictional problems of CIO and AFL unions. In June, agreement was reached on a two-year pact to outlaw raiding between rival unions. By the end of August, both the CIO executive board and the AFL executive council had approved the pact and voted to submit it to their forthcoming conventions. Convention approval would mean the pact would then be offered to affiliated unions for formal signing. "Those that don't sign," said Meany, "can raid and be raided." The next step, if the no-raiding agreement is successful, is for the joint CIO-AFL negotiating committees to tackle the all-important problem of jurisdiction. This goes to the heart of the conflict that created the CIO in 1935 and has kept the labor movement disunited all these years.

As long as Green and the AFL vice presidents who kept him in :activity continued to insist that there was only one labor movement and one legitimate federation of labor, and that the CIO unions, like erring children, must "return to the house of labor" and be dealt with as the executive council saw fit, labor unity talks were futile, empty gestures. Such "unity" would mean the carving up of great industrial unions like the steelworkers, auto workers, rubber workers, woodworkers, and others in such a way as to preserve intact the power of the ruling vice presidents who make up the AFL executive council.

The abandonment of this way of looking at the CIO, if it really has been completely abandoned, is the most noteworthy achievement of Meany's administration so far. It is the only basis on which there can be discussion of no-raiding pacts, jurisdiction agreements, and, finally, complete and organic unity.

While Meany may have considered that the AFL was leading from strength to the CIO's weakness when he first broached the subject of the talks, owing to the power fight that seemed to be going on between Reuther and McDonald, it seems certain that he was also considering labor's weakness as a whole. Avowed "open shoppers" and diehard labor haters were crowding into government. As the appointments of President Eisenhower were announced and the Republican legislative program unfolded, it became certain that the American labor movement could not continue along its old paths of reliance on government and at the same time survive as an effective instrument against economic and social reaction.

One of the biggest underlying factors which has changed the labor picture is this: there was a definite and specific need for a dual labor movement from 1935, when the old "Committee for Industrial

Organization" was formed within the AFL to organize basic industries on an effective, that is, an industrial rather than a craft basis, until the late thirties or early forties. But when the AFL also began to organize on an industrial basis and to take a more and more active part in politics, repudiating its Republican Party vice presidents in the process, the need for a two-pronged labor movement gradually disappeared, until now there seems to be no basis for a divided labor movement either industrially or politically.

Where does John L. Lewis stand amid all the talk of merging federations, no-raid pacts, and joint bargaining agreements involving both AFL and CIO unions? Apparently he is still the gadfly and the rugged skeleton at the feast of reconciliation. There was a spate of speculation during the summer, with Lewis occupying strategic positions in various combinations of gigantic unions which, according to the scuttlebutt, were pulling out of the CIO or the AFL to form a third federation.

Until late August, the speculation had Lewis and his 500,000 coal miners joining with Dave Beck's 1,250,000 or so teamsters, McDonald's 1,250,000 steelworkers, and whatever else McDonald could pull out of the CIO and Beck could take away from the AFL. This was to be a full organizational merger, involving creation of a third federation. But even before Beck was made a vice president of the AFL and denied he had ever contemplated such a sensational coup—McDonald also denied it—the logic of any such combination as steel, coal, and teamsters in a separate federation seemed open to question. A steel-coal combination, even in the sense of the complete merging of the two unions, certainly makes sense. But the day-to-day contacts of steelworkers and coal miners with teamsters are few compared with the day-to-day contacts which all other AFL and CIO unions have with the teamsters. Beck would have little to gain from such an amalgamation except in the well-defined geographical areas where coal and steel are concentrated. He would have much to lose.

A political alignment of these unions, after merger and creation of a new federation, could perhaps spell trouble and uncertainty for Meany and Reuther and the rest of the present leadership of AFL and CIO. Lewis is reported to have as little affection for Meany and Reuther as they seem to have for him. Beck is the powerful and ambitious head of the most powerful union in the AFL which is reaching for a goal of 2 million members. Meany and Reuther might find they had reunited the labor movement only to hand it over to Lewis and Beck. That, however, is strictly in the realm of speculation: there may be enough AFL and CIO leaders who dislike Lewis and Beck sufficiently to offset their dislike of Meany and Reuther.

The struggle of ambitious men for power is about the same

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

whether in government, political parties, university faculties, churches, business firms, newspaper chains, or labor organizations. There is probably no more unscrupulous throat-cutting and back-stabbing in the labor movement than in any other walk of life. All the talk and speculation, then, about the motives that impel the various labor leaders to enter and leave and re-enter and re-shuffle various combinations of labor groups is merely a reminder—much needed it sometimes seems—that the men and women who make up the American labor movement are human beings. (In a way, incidentally, the fact that the shortcomings of labor and labor leaders are played up beyond the shortcomings of all other citizens is a compliment to labor. It is something unexpected and therefore news, and news, incidentally, that needn't be checked.) At the same time, it should not blind us to the fact that concentration on what is going on at high levels in all of these organizations and institutions can give a false picture of what is really important. As in the case of the man on the flying trapeze, there are a lot of roustabouts who could bring him down out of the blue by just forgetting to tighten a nut. That guy with the monkey wrench is important. Most of the men on the flying trapezes know it and, in the final analysis, are guided by their knowledge.

The sudden burgeoning of peace moves in the labor movement has its roots in something more nourishing than the personal feuds and jealousies and ambitions of the Reuthers, Lewises, Meanys, Becks, McDonalds, et al. The jockeying of the top leaders, their feuds and clashes and ripostes, make sensational headlines sometimes, but it is doubtful if the momentary pique of a labor leader can really change the face of the American labor movement. It is true that the temperamental and dictatorial leader of the Brotherhood of Carpenters took "his" union out of the AFL without consulting the 800,000 members. But the carpenters were soon back again. They have too much at stake in association with the rest of the building trades unions to go it alone for very long.

There is great pressure at the local and state levels all over the country for political and economic alignments that will give labor a better break than it has gotten in the past several years. In Oregon, for example, AFL, CIO, farm groups, the independent railroad unions, and other natural allies are cooperating politically to save the state's power resources from the Eisenhower "give-away." And there, for the first time since the CIO unions were expelled from the AFL with a great blowing of trumpets, a CIO official addressed an AFL convention, and the convention was urged by its leaders to cooperate politically with the CIO. This is a landmark. So are the no-raiding pacts and the agreements to practice joint collective bargaining which have been reached by CIO and AFL unions operating in the

MONTHLY REVIEW

same fields. Negotiations on most of these pacts and agreements started even before the AFL and CIO reached their historic agreement against raiding.

Two of the largest unions in the country, the CIO United Automobile Workers and the AFL International Association of Machinists, have not only reaffirmed an existing no-raiding pact but have reached an agreement to conduct joint collective bargaining negotiations on aircraft workers' contracts. The two unions represent 95 percent of the aircraft workers of the country. The Machinists have also signed a no-raiding agreement with the CIO United Rubber Workers and have agreed to take joint action to combat attempts to operate run-away plants, a new clause in such agreements.

The CIO Packinghouse Workers and the AFL Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen have signed a pact to join forces in negotiations and to eliminate raiding and have issued a joint statement urging "eventual unity of labor organizations in one federation." In oil, electrical manufacturing, paper making, farm machinery and equipment, and a number of other fields, the same pressures are at work. The political and economic effect of this "new look" in labor's relations with labor will certainly be appreciable even if the drive toward full organic unity stops here.

To the extent that it is implemented, the decision to stop shuffling membership cards of the already-organized back and forth for little or no net gain will free organizers and business agents and funds so that they can be devoted at long last to the task of organizing the 28 million workers now outside the ranks of organized labor. While the going would be tough and would get tougher, the full carrying out of all the implications of no-raiding, joint bargaining, and "run-away" plant agreements could set off another organizing drive like that of the middle and late thirties. Labor might even topple that last open-shop, low-wage refuge of Northern and Southern capital, the laggard South. The political and economic results of such an achievement in terms of national well-being and social advance would constitute a small and welcome revolution.

What could be the major political results of complete organic unity? It is unlikely that there would be any change in a combined AFL-CIO approach to foreign relations, barring, of course, some event that would awaken the labor movement to the danger of following the foreign policies of its domestic foes. Even the convention vote of the auto workers to revise their past foreign policy and work for a negotiated peace with Soviet Russia was quickly shelved by Reuther. It seems that neither Meany nor Reuther favors the application of collective bargaining principles to international affairs. How much of their attitude is dictated by fear of a depression if "defense"

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

spending were curtailed, how much by an actual belief that the Soviet Union is poised for an attack on the Western world, and how much by sheer political opportunism in a period of anti-Communist hysteria it is difficult to estimate.

One almost certain result, though, would be that the financial and industrial groups which map both our foreign and domestic policies would leap to meet the challenge that a unified or only partially unified labor movement would present domestically in both the political and economic fields.

Already the lunatic fringe is charging that no-raiding pacts and joint bargaining agreements smack of "Communist" tactics. More suave critics of labor see an "impairment of the worker's freedom" if his union and another enter into an agreement not to raid each other's members.

Even the scattered moves toward unity have already given impetus to the drive by labor's enemies for legislation applying the anti-trust laws to labor organizations and restricting the extent of bargaining to small geographical areas or to single companies. If the two conventions, the AFL in St. Louis beginning September 21, and the CIO in Cleveland in November, do go all out for the no-raiding pact, and if their unions and others on a local basis continue to draw together for the protection afforded by mutual bargaining and political action pacts, the drive for new restrictive labor laws may well be the first order of business for the second session of the present Congress.

An all out fight for survival could be the making of a new American labor movement.

SLAVE LABOR WITHOUT TEARS

The State Legislature was urged yesterday by the Prison Association of New York to adopt a broad plan now to utilize prison manpower for defense and preparedness. . . . The association also reviewed the extent of prisoners' contributions in World War II when penal industries produced \$136,000,000 worth of war goods. . . . The labor of prisoners is contributed "without strikes, absenteeism, or complaints of overtime," the group reported.

—*New York Times*, Feb. 5, 1951

NATIONALISM AND LABOR IN IRELAND

BY ANDREW BOYD

PART 1

On the Easter of 1916 the Irish Republican organizations (the Irish Volunteers, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and the proletarian Irish Citizen Army), adhering to the extreme Nationalist doctrine that "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity," raised an armed rebellion and from their headquarters in the General Post Office, Dublin, issued the proclamation of the Irish Republic. This proclamation declared the "right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people."

The Easter Rebellion has been described as the first blow struck against the imperialist war. It was also the spiritual regeneration of the Irish nation which until then had been content to follow the constitutional Westminster politicians of the Irish Parliamentary Party—and the Irish Parliamentary Party, led by Redmond and Dillon, was, like the labor leaders in Britain, supporting the imperialist war effort.

The Republicans had been preparing their forces for rebellion for years before the outbreak of war in 1914. The Irish Republican Brotherhood was a select group of revolutionary leaders which had been founded in the United States by Irish political exiles in 1858, and which from that date exerted a secret and powerful influence on Irish political movements. In 1913, the IRB made approaches to other Nationalist groups, and from these overtures the Irish Volunteers movement was formed under middle-class leadership. In the same year, the workers of Dublin, led by the Marxian Socialist Connolly and the daring Jim Larkin, fought one of the longest and bitterest strikes in working-class history against the Dublin transport employers for the right to hold trade union membership. In this strike, working-class lives were lost and the Irish Citizen Army was born.

Andrew Boyd is a shop steward and leading member of his local of the Amalgamated Engineering Union in Belfast, Northern Ireland. He is a veteran lecturer and writer for the left-wing press, and is now collecting material for a history of the Irish trade union movement.

NATIONALISM AND LABOR IN IRELAND

This was probably the first proletarian army in Europe, and it is estimated that in the Easter Rebellion the majority of those who fought in Dublin were working-class members of the Irish Citizen Army.

The aftermath of the militarily unsuccessful Easter Rebellion—the execution of the Republicans' principal leaders and the imprisonment of scores of others—led to a reawakening of the latent nationalist spirit of Ireland and a spontaneous nation-wide recruitment to the underground Irish Republican Army. The aim of the insurgents of Easter Week was being achieved. Their rising had inspired the nation, and out of the flames of insurrection was arising a new Ireland, an Ireland that was rejecting constitutional methods of gaining her freedom and in fact organizing the most widespread rebellion in her long tormented history of struggle.

The Republicans entered the elections of 1918 and won a majority in the constituencies of Ireland. These elections were for the British Parliament at Westminster; out of 105 candidates returned for Ireland, 73 were Republicans, 26 pro-British Tory-Unionists, and only 6 were of the Irish Parliamentary Party. The Republicans, however, instead of taking their seats at Westminster, as all Irish members had done since the Act of Union in 1800, formed themselves into Dail Eireann (Parliament of Ireland) and set up their own Republican Government. This was the famous first Sinn Fein government which operated as an underground administration, floated loans, and made pacts with foreign governments. British law was defied throughout Ireland, the Crown courts and magistrates were ignored, while Republican courts set up by Sinn Fein became the real power for administering justice in Ireland.

While Republican Ireland, which had the allegiance of four-fifths of the Irish people, was gallantly fighting for independence, the community of militantly religious Protestants, numbering fewer than one million in the Northern province of Ulster, cast in their lot with the Empire and became enthusiastic levies of the British. Ulster was dominated by a ruling class who were members of the British Tory Party and whose economic interests made them part of the British imperialist system. These Ulster Tories saw that on religious differences they could erect a barrier between Protestant and Catholic Irishmen which would effectively weaken the chances of Ireland's becoming an independent republic. For many years—before even the opening of the twentieth century—Ulster's Tories had been preparing the Ulster people for the role they would play in defending the interests of the British Empire. They had created an atmosphere of mass hysteria in which religious hatred was the dominating influence. The fact that these Tories were employers of labor gave

MONTHLY REVIEW

them a further reason for fostering religious animosities amongst the workers of Ulster. They recognized that an alliance of Catholic and Protestant workers—which inevitably arises in times of industrial struggle—would be a threat to their position as exploiters. The religious difference is still being unscrupulously used by the British ruling class and their friends among the Ulster landowners and capitalists, who not only have separated Ulster from the rest of Ireland but within Ulster have separated worker from worker.

In 1919 British governmental machinery in Ireland was breaking down. Isolated skirmishes between bands of Irish Republicans and units of the British army rapidly developed into full-scale guerilla war between Britain and Ireland. This Anglo-Irish war raged fiercely throughout all the counties of Ireland for more than two years. The British, though their administration in Ireland was nearly destroyed, gained strength from the stubborn resistance of the Ulster Unionists and reverted to the most terroristic methods of warfare. In the North they used the terror gangs of Ulster Unionism, and in other parts of Ireland they introduced the murderous corps known as Black and Tans, who used violence not only against the soldiers of the IRA but also against the ordinary noncombatant Irish people. Women and children and aged people suffered from the violence of the Black and Tans.

In the summer of 1921 a truce was made to allow De Valera, President of Dail Eireann, to negotiate in London with Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister. But De Valera broke off these negotiations when it became clear that the British government had already decided to partition Ireland and had agreed with the Ulster Unionist leaders to set up a separate government for the six northern counties. Diplomatically, De Valera was the master in these negotiations and in the correspondence that later passed between him and Lloyd George. But the British government cared nothing for negotiations, and with all the might and wealth of their empire behind them they threatened total war against Ireland if the partition settlement were not accepted.

Immediately after De Valera's return to Ireland, Dail Eireann unanimously rejected Lloyd George's proposals. In the autumn of 1921 another delegation was sent to London with powers to negotiate a settlement that would accord with the Dail's policy. But this delegation, instead of negotiating a settlement that would recognize the unity and sovereignty of Ireland, brought back the terms of the infamous Treaty, which they had signed at midnight on December 6th. These terms were essentially those which De Valera and Dail Eireann had rejected earlier in the year and which the Dail had again re-

NATIONALISM AND LABOR IN IRELAND

jected only two days before the Irish delegates in London had agreed to them.

Lloyd George had obtained this agreement by again threatening total war against Ireland, but he knew also that Arthur Griffiths, the most politically influential of the Irish delegates, was easily swayed by blandishments or threats. Griffiths was never really a republican although he had thrown his political weight behind the separatist movement after 1916, but that was only because the constitutionalists of the Irish Parliamentary Party had been completely discredited in Ireland. It was Griffiths who influenced the other four Irish delegates, especially Michael Collins—who was a soldier rather than a politician and who may have believed that Lloyd George's threats would have been carried out—to disobey the instructions of their government and accept the Treaty terms.

It was, then, the Treaty signed in London in 1921 that established the partition of Ireland. Ostensibly, the partition was based on the religious difference: the majority of the people of Ireland as a whole (32 counties) are Catholic and anti-imperialist, but the majority within the partitioned part (six counties) are Protestant and pro-British. Thus after many centuries of struggle for national independence, Ireland was divided into two separate states. One, now called the Republic of Eire, consists of the 26 nationalist counties, while the other, the six counties of Northern Ireland, remains in the British Empire and carries on an unceasing propaganda and ideological war against nationalist Ireland. Northern Ireland is economically more fortunate than any other part of Ireland because within its boundaries are situated the developed industries of shipbuilding, engineering, textiles, and the like, which are on a par with British industry and well ahead of industrial development in the rest of Ireland.

One immediate result of the Treaty was violent civil war among the nationalists in the 26 counties. The Irish Republican Army, which had fought a heroic revolutionary war for six years—if the Rebellion of 1916 be regarded as the beginning of military operations against the British—split into anti-Treaty Republicans who demanded, like the martyrs of 1916, an independent and united Irish Republic, and pro-Treaty Free Staters, so called because they accepted partition and were satisfied with an Irish Free State within the British Commonwealth. In this civil war, some of the best popular leaders of the Irish people, like the socialist Liam Mellows and the democratic Republicans Cathal Brugha and Rory O'Connor, perished at the hands of the pro-Treaty forces. The pro-Treaty party, with British material help, formed the Irish Free State government in 1922. The civil war ended in 1924 when the Republicans retreated and, on

the advice of their leader Eamon De Valera, boycotted all open political action—but held on to their arms. In 1928, they dropped the boycott of politics, formed the Fainna Fail party, and became a strong political force in the country. The Treaty split is today expressed in the two main capitalist parties in the 26 counties: the Fine Gael party of the pro-Treaty politicians, and Fianna Fail. Fine Gael represents the more conservative wing of Irish nationalism and stands for close financial ties with Britain; while Fianna Fail, broadly speaking, is the party of independent native Irish capitalism.

The Fianna Fail party first won the Dail elections in 1932, and, except for the brief reign of the coalition of five parties from 1948 till 1951, it has held governmental power ever since. Though Fianna Fail has done nothing to fulfill its promises to end partition—promises which are renewed at every election—it has removed some of the lesser but still objectionable articles of the Treaty. In 1938, it won back the Irish ports which Britain was using as strategic naval bases. It abolished the position of Governor-General and instituted instead the late Dr. Douglas Hyde—renowned patriot, Celtic scholar, and founder of the Irish language revival movement—as the first President of Eire. It stopped the payment of land annuities to Britain. These were the repayments of loans which, under the Land Purchase Acts, bought out the Anglo-Irish landlord class. Fianna Fail also went a long way towards building up native Irish industries and protecting them with a tariff system. The economic war which De Valera's government waged against Britain in the middle thirties is well remembered.

During World War II, De Valera's policy of neutrality for the 26 counties had the support of the overwhelming majority of the people in that part of Ireland. The popularity of his party has, however, suffered in the postwar period, possibly because it had been too long in the seats of government and possibly because it did nothing to solve the harassing problems of unemployment and emigration, but also because of the increased activity of the Irish Labor Party and the trade union movement. Since 1948, when Fianna Fail temporarily lost power, a strong majority government in Ireland has been impossible. This is technically due to the electoral system of proportionate representation which is very fair and democratic but which allows a great variety of parties, groupings, and individuals to sit in the national parliament. At present De Valera's party is in power only with the support of a group of independent representatives.

Another immediate result of the Treaty of 1921 was the intensified persecution, within that part of Ireland which remained with the Empire, of the Catholic and nationalist minority. One of the first laws passed by the newly formed Northern Ireland govern-

NATIONALISM AND LABOR IN IRELAND

ment in 1922 was the Special Powers Act which gives the government and the police extraordinary powers of arrest and detention on suspicion only. This law can abolish trial by jury, suspend habeas corpus, and establish the government's right to imprison for an indefinite period without trial or charge. The Special Powers Act, which was passed in 1922 as a temporary measure, still remains an effective and often-invoked law in Northern Ireland. It was originally intended to be used only against armed Republican opponents of the Ulster Tories, but it has often been used against leaders of the working-class movement, especially in the prewar depression days when mass demonstrations of unemployed workers protested against their depressed conditions.

At the beginning of the Tory-Unionist regime in Northern Ireland, a special armed auxiliary police force was formed from the most loyal supporters of Ulster Toryism. This force is never used for ordinary police duties but is kept in a constant state of readiness for periods of political unrest or for special occasions when anti-government demonstrations are held. It is significant that from 1921 till 1926 the British Government contributed £5 million towards the upkeep of this force, and present-day budgets of Northern Ireland's Minister of Home Affairs always include a similar large sum for the Special Constabulary. It is equally significant that a selected band of Ulster policemen and Special Constables have been sent to assist the present Greek government in its police problems.

Though the Ulster Tories have always boasted that their policy is to follow step-by-step with Britain in legislation and reforms, Northern Ireland is in many respects far behind Britain. The "step-by-step" policy was quite suitable when Tory governments in Britain were following their traditional policies, but when the Labor Party gained power in 1945 and introduced a number of reforms, it became an awkward policy to follow. Thus the Trade Disputes Act, by which the British Tories in 1927 hoped to prevent a recurrence of the general strike, remains a law in Northern Ireland though it was repealed in England in 1946. Elections to city corporations and local councils in Northern Ireland are on a property and rate-paying franchise, whereas in England (and in Eire) they are on a universal franchise.

The Unionist-Tories in Northern Ireland represent the most conservative and reactionary of all the capitalist-class interests in Ireland. Economically, they have descended from Anglo-Irish land-lordism or have risen with nineteenth century capitalism. They are an inseparable section of the British imperialist ruling class, because most of them are still big landowners and combine their landowning with control of Northern Ireland's industries which are held firmly

within the economic empire of Britain's banks and monopolies. They have for generations supplied Britain with some of her leading militarists—General Templar in Malaya is the latest example. Their political organization—the Ulster Unionist Party—is an affiliated section of the British Conservative and Unionist Association (that is, the Tory Party).

The unjust partition of Ireland has its origins in a continuous British policy, stretching over centuries, of keeping Ireland economically weak while British capitalism developed. Poyning's Law in the reign of Henry VII forbade the Irish parliament to pass laws which were not first approved by the English government. The Act of Union in 1800 abolished the Irish parliament altogether. The Treaty of 1921 forcibly partitioned the country. And the Ireland Bill passed by the British Labor Government in 1949 was designed to make partition permanent by guaranteeing British support and arms for the Ulster Tories so long as the parliament of Northern Ireland wished to remain in the United Kingdom.

Throughout the centuries of English rule in Ireland, the stronger British governments have prevented the economic development of Ireland by direct interference. In the 17th century, the flourishing Irish woolen cloth industry was destroyed by English legislation, and restrictive maritime regulations were framed to prevent the growth of an Irish merchant navy. The economic legislation which England applied against the Irish was so stringent that for two centuries, it is estimated, Ireland lived on the proceeds of smuggling. Furthermore, the dreadful feudal system imposed upon Gaelic society by Elizabethan England and subsequent centuries of rack-renting landlordism restricted progress in agricultural techniques and prevented that accumulation of capital which, given normal development, would have created an Irish industrial system. Ireland today is an agricultural country poor in industries because generations of absentee landlords drained away Irish wealth and invested it in British industry or squandered it in London.

Even in the privileged North, with all its industry, the economic balance is still on the side of agriculture. The important *economic* reason why Ireland remains partitioned is that the British ruling class understands that a divided Ireland, with her industrial area under the control of England, could never become economically strong enough to be a serious rival to British trade and manufacture.

Another, equally important but non-economic, reason is Northern Ireland's strategic position as a bridgehead in the North Atlantic. In his victory speech in 1945, Churchill was lavish in his praise for those who had held this bridgehead and venomous in his attacks on De Valera's neutrality. And in the debate on the Ireland Bill in

NATIONALISM AND LABOR IN IRELAND

1949, Herbert Morrison admitted that "more than the will of Ulster was involved, the whole future and safety of Great Britain was also involved." Northern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom is today in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and provides bases for British and American armed forces.

The rest of Ireland officially adheres to the policy of neutrality and refuses to be part of any military alliance. This policy undoubtedly has the support of the majority of the people of the 26 counties, but there are certain vociferous right-wing politicians in nationalist Ireland who take the view that Ireland should join the anti-Soviet alliance unconditionally, on the ground that the Irish, being in religion mainly Catholic, are or should be *ipso facto* anti-Communist. Others, like some of the ministers in the late coalition, believe that Ireland's participation in NATO should be traded for the ending of partition. Some of the resolutions on Irish partition, like the recent unsuccessful Fogarty resolution, which are occasionally debated in the American House of Representatives, are designed not so much to help Ireland in her struggle for unity, as to give encouragement to these Irish friends of NATO. The policy of De Valera and his party is that Ireland's right to unity is unconditional, and even if unity should be achieved by the help of United States pressure on Great Britain, Ireland's attitude to military alliances, especially with England, would be determined by the best interests of the Irish people.

This does not mean that Fianna Fail is not anti-Communist. In connection with NATO, it has stated that it has sympathies but not commitments, meaning of course that its ideology is similar to that of the Western powers and it has accepted help under the Marshall Plan. Yet neither this sympathy nor this financial help could induce Fianna Fail to participate in any future war against the will of the Irish people. It is possible that Ireland, if the outlook of her people remains as anti-imperialist as it is now, will, like Sweden and Switzerland, maintain a biased neutrality in a war-threatened Europe.

(To be continued)

Why talk about the right to live under capitalism? If a man had all the patriotism of a Robert Emmet or a George Washington, if he had all the genius of a Goldsmith or a Mangan, if he had all the religion of a St. Simeon Stylites or a St. Francis d'Assisi, if he belongs to the working class he has no right to live in this world unless a capitalist can see his way to make a profit out of him.

—James Connolly

'LEST WE FORGET'

When Europe first, at heaven's command,
Made half the earth colonial land,
She counted only cash in hand,
Nor thought it any burden.

But as the profiteering soared,
Some felt that they'd misheard the Lord,
Whose moral voice now sternly roared:
"Don't forget the White Man's Burden!"

And missionaries of every creed,
Pulpit, press, and state agreed,
Any progress that the natives need
Should be the white man's burden.

So when in some colonial land
The natives tried to take a hand,
Guns barked a chorus of command:
"Hands off! it's the *White Man's Burden*."

Still as the cost of empire soars,
And profits go for dirty wars,
The liberals prescribe Point Fours
To ease the white man's burden.

But from paddy, hut, and palm-leaf shack,
Where men are yellow, brown, or black,
The voices swell: "Get off our back!
"We're *through* with the White Man's Burden."

—John Bowman

The word has circulated that you don't have to go hungry and sick all your life, that it is possible to be free and to run your own affairs. Yes, the revolution of 1776 rides again. People of the so-called backward countries are reaching and struggling upward for that human dignity which comes with abundance and self-reliance and freedom.

—Murray D. Lincoln, President of the
Cooperative League of the United States

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Amsterdam, August 28

Forces Behind The French Strikes

The strikes which swept France in mid-August are episodes in a much larger drama—the struggle for the control of policy making in Western Europe. Two counter-revolutionary forces have dominated the policies of Western Europe since the war's end in 1945. One is the Vatican. The other is Washington. Rome and Washington are jointly responsible for the present political situation in France, Italy, and West Germany.

Rome-Washington policy is designed to encircle, contain, undermine, and if possible destroy Communist regimes and the Communist movement. The means to these ends have been the rehabilitation of private enterprise, the integration of the Western European economy, and the organization of a Western European military alliance, including West Germany. In order to achieve these results, Rome and Washington have supported bourgeois governments directed by middle-of-the-road parties, dominated in all three cases by the Catholics.

Marshall Plan aid, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the rearmament program, financed from Washington and ballyhooed by all available propaganda techniques, were employed to convince the people of Western Europe that the 19th century social institutions which heaped up profits and built empires could still protect and promote the general welfare in the middle of the 20th century.

Present-day political developments are proving the fallacy of such assumptions. In France as well as in Italy and West Germany, governments accepting Rome-Washington leadership have steadily lost popular support. In France, popular distrust and apprehension have expressed themselves in a near-general strike, unplanned, ill-prepared, and inadequately led, which mushroomed to national proportions in the course of a week.

It is characteristic of revolutionary situations that the well-financed moves of reaction, backed by state authority, succeed temporarily in damming up revolutionary impulses. But instead of dissipat-

ing them, the counter-revolutionary drives only heap up revolutionary forces to a level from which they sweep, irresistibly, to success. This seems to be what is happening in Western Europe today. How else can one interpret the stubborn insistence with which Italian and French millions have continued to vote Communist and the sudden conversion of a strike of French postal employees into a major upheaval?

Three Democracies

The Times of London printed a somber editorial on July 30, 1953, entitled "Three Democracies." The first paragraph paid respects to DeGasperi, regretted the rejection of his government in the recent Italian election, and ended thus: "The June elections have produced a deadlock disturbingly like the state of the French Parliament."

Turning to France, the editor noted that "the Fourth Republic has not only failed to avoid the defects of the Third, it has reproduced them in an exaggerated form." "Paralysis in French government" may be due to the fact that "the tasks it has taken on were too much for it."

The editor then discusses Germany. "West Germany, the youngest republic of all, is fortunate in having two great parties, the Christian Democrats and the Social Democrats, which offer an alternative to each other. . . . Deeply divided by their views of social development, economics, and the conduct of foreign policy, these two dominant parties in the Federal Republic are agreed in their opposition to Communism." Evidently the editor has forgotten that under the German Republic, inaugurated in 1919, when opposition to Communism was not the major issue, splinter parties sprang up all over Germany as they have in Italy and France. Also he has overlooked the fact that the present government of West Germany has a law on its statute books specifically aimed at cutting down the number of small parties. For the coming German elections, the eighteen parties which entered nominations have been reduced by the authorities to eight parties whose candidates will appear on the ballot.

While *The Times* editorial of July 30 laments the signs of disintegration and decay which have appeared in all three of the recently formed or reconstituted Western European "democracies," it does not even suggest that the principles of individualism, private enterprise, and national sovereignty upon which all three governments are set up are as outdated as the stagecoach and the tallow candle; nor is there any recognition of the obvious fact that all three republics are suffering from the same mortal ailment—inability to adapt eighteenth

century political institutions to revolutionized economic processes and basically altered social forces.

Armorer To The World

President Roosevelt envisioned the United States as "the arsenal of democracy." Under Truman and Eisenhower, the country has become increasingly the armorer of the world. The United States is now providing military equipment to about 47 foreign countries. For the first half of 1953, in pursuit of its "safety and self-interest," the United States shipped abroad two-thirds more military supplies than during the previous six months. Up to the end of May 1953, deliveries since the beginning of the mutual security program have included 26,564 tanks and combat vehicles, 25,234 artillery pieces, 510 naval vessels, 4,126 aircraft, 1.5 million machine guns and small arms, 20 million rounds of artillery ammunition, and more than 700 million rounds of machine gun and small arms ammunition. In addition to these military supplies, the United States Treasury is paying munition factories in a number of foreign countries to produce weapons and munitions which are distributed on orders from Washington.

There was a report, in 1914, that the Krupp works had delivered military equipment to 58 countries. When war broke out, there was an overwhelming probability that no matter which way they turned, German soldiers would be shot down with German-made ammunition. The United States Government, by its world-wide distribution of armaments makes it overwhelmingly probable that in the case of another war, American boys, turn where they may, will be torn to pieces by munitions made in the United States, or made abroad on orders from the United States, paid for with United States tax money, and placed in the hands of potential enemies by the Washington authorities.

Shadow Over Asia?

Newsweek for August 17, 1953, printed on its front cover the picture of a grim Japanese boy, in uniform, with a gun across his shoulder. The eyes are sullen, the mouth set. The boy would be an ugly customer in a death-grapple. On an inside page, the editors explain: "This soldier is a member of Japan's national safety corps, which someday will become the new Japanese Army, and which already casts its shadow across the Asiatic continent." On another page of the same issue, the editors state that plans are afoot to expand the Japanese army to 350,000 men equipped with United States made weapons. Already Japan has "a small navy," "a fledgling air force," and an industry capable of producing most modern implements for destroying and killing.

MONTHLY REVIEW

Take another look at the picture of the grim boy on the *Newsweek* cover. Who wrecked his country's economy? The United States. Who dropped an atom bomb on his uncle in Hiroshima and his cousin in Nagasaki? The United States. Who imposed on his proud, undefeated nation the humiliation of unconditional surrender? The United States. Who made the gun and put it on his shoulder? The United States.

Then look on page 20 of the same *Newsweek* issue: "The unpleasant, the surprising fact is that in few countries has the American position been weakened as it has in Japan." With terrifying rapidity United States unpopularity has been increasing in Japan. The *Newsweek* cover boy may have that hard, set, sullen expression on his face because he is thinking of what he will do to the United States and its citizens at the first opportunity.

The new Japanese military machine, which is being created by the United States, in violation of the Japanese constitution and against strong popular Japanese opposition, may be casting its shadow over Asia, or it may be casting it over America and the disintegrating western world.

Between the Lines

Anyone who listens to Secretary Dulles or who takes Senator McCarthy seriously would imagine that the issue of East-West trade was dead and buried under State Department edicts and Senate committee denunciations. But along comes *U.S. News & World Report* in its July 31 issue, with these assurances: "The wraps are coming off trade with the Soviet Union. U.S. may not like it, but U.S. allies are plunging in, signing up right and left. Biggest deal, one involving Britain and Russia, is coming up." (This deal was later publicized as an order from hard-pressed British shipbuilders for fishing vessels and fishing factory ships.) *U.S. News & World Report* editors point out that likewise involved in these deals are Japan, Australia, France, Denmark, Sweden, Netherlands, Argentina, and Iran. The *New York Journal of Commerce* (International edition, Aug. 8, 1953) predicted that "new and stronger efforts among European countries to increase trade with China are in the making. There has been a good deal of pressure in this direction during the past several months—as evidenced by the visits to Peiping of missions representing groups of European businessmen." During August, British papers, particularly those dealing with business matters, have published column after column describing the need of East-West trade as an outlet for Western Europe, and reporting various instances of its revival and expansion.

There is an old and true saying that one should read between

the lines. When dealing with politics and economics, it is also necessary to read behind the lines. No matter what politicians may say, their profit-seeking masters never forget that "business is business," or, in another version of the same theme, "love will find a way."

This Is Capitalism

When I first saw the German industrial complex known as the Ruhr area, it was an intricate network of railroads, canals, and highways, tying together Dusseldorf, Essen, Dortmund, Duisburg, and the other population nuclei with their mines, mills, and factories. The Ruhr area was planned and developed by some of the most competent industrialists, scientists, and engineers of Europe. It was neat, orderly, and so efficient that it was nosing ahead of British, French, and Belgian producers of coal, iron, and steel.

Twice during the past twenty years I have seen a profusion of grass, weeds, and even brush growing in the railroad and factory yards of the chief Ruhr cities. The first time was in 1931-1932. On the second occasion, weeds and brush were also growing on the war ruins of station platforms, bridges, factories, and dwellings, while skeletons of railway cars, rubble, and twisted metal cluttered many parts of the Ruhr area. In 1931-1932 a glutted capitalist economy imposed upon its hapless victims the economic price of its continuance—depression. In 1938-53 capitalism imposed its political price—the dislocation, disruption, and disaster of war.

Natural resources have remained substantially the same during these decades. Technical facilities and human experience have been extended. It is the increasing inability of the capitalist oligarchy to manage and control its sprawling, grotesque, monstrous progeny which has brought disaster upon classical scenes of its profiteering and freebooting such as the Ruhr.

Sun, Air, and Light

Among the shattered ruins of Hamburg, Germany, in a wreck of a building held together by propping and scaffolding, we said to our hostess, "You have a sunny kitchen." "Yes," she said, looking across the empty lots and gaping cellar holes that had previously formed a courtyard, "Adolf Hitler said 'Give me ten years and I will provide you with air, light, and sun!' He was right; we now have all three. But what a price we paid."

"American-minded"

In Copenhagen, at supper with some Danish friends, we were discussing an acquaintance who was an outstanding example of con-

servatism, arrogance, narrowness, prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry.

"Well," said one of the women present, by way of summing up the matter, "we would call him 'American-minded'."

We pricked up our ears. Had we heard aright? It was the first time we had met the phrase used in such a context. The discussion went on for some time. Again the same expression was used. It was the best phrase they knew to express the antithesis of libertarianism. It was used with particular emphasis and was taken as a matter of course by those present. Among these well-read, intelligent Danish people, conservatism, arrogance, narrowness, prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry are best described by one adjective: "American-minded."

World Youth Festival

Bucharest played host to young people from all over the world during the closing days of July and the first two weeks of August 1953. The Third Congress of the World Federation of Democratic Youth was followed by a fortnight of festivities, including cultural, sport, and social events. *The Times* of London in its August 7 issue conceded "more than 30,000" participants from "nearly every country in the world," and reported that the preparations were "on an unprecedented scale for this part of the world." These preparations included a new stadium seating 80,000 and a new theatre accommodating 4,000. *The Times* account continued: "The streets are decorated with the flags of the nations, and baby blue and the white dove of peace have, for the time being, at least, displaced red with the hammer and sickle as the main decorative motif." Organizers of the event claimed representatives from 111 countries, with the largest single delegation (3,000) coming from France.

As our State Department passport carries a specific prohibition against traveling in Eastern Europe, we were unable to see this world gathering, so we had to content ourselves with reading about it and talking to some of the young people who were streaming back from Bucharest into Western Europe after the middle of August.

The young folks seem to have been most impressed by the world-wide scope of the Bucharest gathering. They commented on the large numbers of delegates from Latin America, the 300 delegates from Japan, and the impressive delegations from China and other countries of Asia. A second comment of the returning delegates was a song of praise to the Rumanian organizers of the conference. In addition to the large body of delegates from foreign countries, tens of thousands from Bucharest and environs flocked to witness and participate in the festivities. The Western young people expected that under the pressure of such throngs they would have to put up with

inconvenience and perhaps hardship. Some went with tents and sleeping bags. To their surprise and delight, food, shelter, and transportation were provided without a hitch, and the multitude of sporting and social events were run off on schedule. A third comment concerned the unusual opportunities which the Bucharest meeting offered for young people from Holland, for example, to meet and understand young people from a former Dutch colony, Indonesia. They reported spontaneous affection between the erstwhile exploiters and exploited.

All of the returning delegates with whom we have spoken returned to the West filled with enthusiasm for what they had seen and heard, and thankful for their good fortune at having had a share in this unforgettable gathering. They also brought back glowing accounts of the opportunities open to young people in the new Rumania and of the notable achievements of the present Rumanian regime.

A not-too-large and relatively poor Rumania has been able to offer hospitality to tens of thousands of young folks from more than a hundred countries. Judging from reports, the Rumanians enjoyed the experience as much as their youthful guests. The previous gathering was held in East Berlin. The next is scheduled for Peking. Thus, year after year, the flower of Eastern youth foregathers for memorable days of business and pleasure and invites the youth of the West to join with them.

Western leaders profess an interest in selling their "free" way of life to the world. Hence the millions of dollars spent on propaganda, on sabotage, on espionage, on subversion across the line which separates East from West. Why not announce a meeting and festival for the summer of 1954 at which the rich and powerful United States, for example, could play host to 100,000 of the youth of the world, without regard to race, creed, color, or political affiliation? It would mean suspending the infamous McCarran Immigration Act for the occasion and temporarily or permanently curtailing the activities of McCarthy, Velde and Co., but consider the advantage of being able to bring young people together from a hundred or more countries, to pay their travelling and living expenses, and to treat them with the exuberant generosity which the people of Rumania displayed during July and August, 1953. Can it be that the harried master-mariners who pilot the Western ship of state lack the imagination needed to sponsor and carry through such a project? Or are they fearful of what the assembled youth might say to their elders or to each other, and of the peace and friendship which would be engendered?

EMPIRE BUILDING: 1953 STYLE A COMMENT

BY JULIAN FRIEDMAN

It takes just such excellent reporting as Basil Davidson's in "Empire Building: 1953 Style" (MR, August 1953) to bring Africa out of the dark. But because he concentrates on mining imperialism, his political analysis is necessarily incomplete. Consequently, one could get from Mr. Davidson's article the erroneous impression of an expanding British position fortified by American interests in southern Africa. The very opposite impression would conform more closely to the political realities there. The new Central Africa Federation reflects the weakness rather than the strength of the British Empire. Malanism is reducing its power in South Africa, while conditions are in the making for a *pax Americana* to replace the *pax Britannica*, with the United States taking the place of Britain as the policeman of Africa.

The struggle between Africans and Europeans is not the only struggle in progress on the continent. Political conflict among the Africans and especially among the Europeans in Africa is no less important. At this stage, inter-European rivalry is still the most advanced form of political competition in Africa. It exists to some extent among the European empires, and it is no negligible factor in the expansion of American interests in Africa. Needless to say, of all these struggles, that between the English and Boers of South Africa is for the time being the most obvious. What the British won in the Boer War a half century ago, Malanism is wiping out. The English there now seem doomed to the position of a minority people in the "white" community.

The Central Africa Federation cannot be understood without taking into account those developments that jeopardize the British position in South Africa. In view of this change of fortune, the scheme appears to be a British effort to offset political losses in southern Africa. Without question, mining imperialism fits into the whole complex of forces giving birth to the Federation, while the "white" politicians talk *ad nauseum* about checking the spread of Gold Coastism to Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. However, it is probably Malanism that best explains the support the Federation has gotten

The author is an expert on colonial problems who formerly taught at the London School of Economics. At present he is on the faculty of an American university, teaching a course on "Political Institutions of Africa."

in the past few years in the United Kingdom, particularly in the anti-imperialist circles of the Labor movement. It will be recalled that it was the Atlee Government that, after substantially altering its policy on central Africa, gave the go ahead to federation negotiations.

Concerned with Malanism but not to the extent of inviting an open break with Dr. Malan, the Labor and Tory parties seem to be pursuing the alternative policy of building a counterweight to South Africa. As a Conservative Minister of State put it last year, Central Africa can become "a new British bastion of power."

There are any number of matters to bring the new Central Africa government into conflict with Dr. Malan's. The ultimate disposition of Bechuanaland, the labor supply for the gold and diamond mines, and transportation arrangements in the region are but a few of the most provocative. Of course, when African nationalism endangers European supremacy, cooperation between these two nations is by no means out of the question. However, at this time, the factors generating hostility are still in the ascendency. Central Africa Federation is likely to turn the long-standing enmity between the British and Boers into an intense international rivalry.

Mr. Davidson makes amply clear how rapidly the United States is moving into a position of leadership in Central Africa. If it looms large in the life of that area, it is no less a major element in the affairs of South Africa. As Dr. Malan increases his own difficulties with the British Commonwealth, he becomes more and more dependent on the United States. If there are serious troubles between the British and Boers, the United States will be involved in one way or another: there is little doubt that it will be a party to the terms on which they conduct their relations. The opportunity to be mediator and policeman in defense of American interests is apparent enough.

What is even more striking than the American role in mining imperialism in Central Africa is the fact that the United States has a foot in every European camp in southern Africa. Its world power position manifests itself in Africa in terms of interests in every territory, originating not only from investments but also from Marshall Plan and Mutual Security Aid commitments. From these vantage points, the United States pushes for closer collaboration among the empires of Africa, particularly among those colonies that perform complementary activities required for getting strategic raw materials into American stockpiles.

With so many connections, the United States cannot help becoming a principal arbiter in the affairs of Africa. Its policies must figure in the relations between Europeans and Africans. The day cannot be far off when African nationalism will be as challenging a problem for the American people as Asian nationalism is today.

***Ideal Xmas Presents —
3 New MR Press Books***

The Treason of the Senate

by

David Graham Phillips

See review by Harvey O'Connor in this issue

Price on publication Oct. 15, 1953 — \$4.75 per copy
Prepublication price — \$2.50 (you save \$2.25)
Combination price with MR — \$5.00 (you save \$2.75)

The World The Dollar Built

by

Gunther Stein

"Well informed as well as eloquently written."
—*Economic Journal*, organ of the British Royal Economic Society,
in its review of the English edition.

Price on publication Nov. 1, 1953 — \$4.00 per copy
Prepublication price — \$2.00 (you save \$2.00)
Combination price with MR — \$5.00 (you save \$2.00)

The Present As History

by

Paul M. Sweezy

For details see facing page

See back cover for bargain combination offers of these and other books.

The Present As History: Essays and Reviews On Capitalism and Socialism

By PAUL M. SWEETZ

Part I — THE CHARACTER OF OUR EPOCH

1. THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO AFTER 100 YEARS
2. TOYNBEE'S UNIVERSAL HISTORY
3. THE ILLUSION OF THE MANAGERIAL REVOLUTION
4. THE MARSHALL PLAN AND THE CRISIS OF WESTERN EUROPE
5. MARXISM IN THE EAST: DECOMPOSITION OR ENRICHMENT?

Part II — IMPERIALISM

6. A MARXIST VIEW OF IMPERIALISM
7. THREE WORKS ON IMPERIALISM

Part III — AMERICAN CAPITALISM

8. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN AMERICAN CAPITALISM
9. THE AMERICAN RULING CLASS
10. CAPITALISM AND RACE RELATIONS
11. THE HEYDAY OF THE INVESTMENT BANKER
12. INTEREST GROUPS IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY
13. THE DECLINE OF THE INVESTMENT BANKER
14. CRITICS AND CRUSADERS
15. SOCIALIST HUMANITARIANISM
16. AN ECONOMIC PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Part IV — GERMAN CAPITALISM

17. THE GERMAN PROBLEM
18. NATIONAL SOCIALISM
19. POST MORTEM
20. RESURRECTION?

Part V — THINKERS AND THEORIES

21. JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES
22. PIGOU AND THE CASE FOR SOCIALISM
23. HANSEN AND THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM
24. SCHUMPETER'S THEORY OF INNOVATION
25. HAYEK'S ROAD TO SERFDOM
26. ROSA LUXEMBURG AND THE THEORY OF CAPITALISM
27. THORSTEIN VEBLEN: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Part VI — SOME PROBLEMS IN POLITICAL ECONOMY

28. MARXISM AND ORTHODOX ECONOMICS
29. FABIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY
30. SCIENCE, MARXISM, AND DEMOCRACY
31. STRATEGY FOR SOCIALISM
32. A CRUCIAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CAPITALISM AND SOCIALISM?
33. A REPLY TO CRITICS
34. PEACE AND PROSPERITY

Price on Publication December 1, 1953 \$5.00 per copy
Prepublication price \$3.00 (you save \$2.00)
Combination price with MR \$5.00 (you save \$3.00)

**COMING IN NEXT MONTH'S MR
TWO IMPORTANT ARTICLES ON CHINA**

"Letters from a Visitor to China"

By JOAN ROBINSON
World-Famous British Economist

"Britain, China, and the USA"

By GEOFFREY BING
British Labor MP

Americans are not getting the truth about China, or about China's importance to our relations with the rest of the world. No American reporters are allowed to go to China. Our country is living behind a self-imposed curtain, blinded to one of the greatest events in history — the Chinese Revolution.

Here are two revealing reports by eminent Britons, one a Cambridge University economist, the other a Labor Member of Parliament who has been in the forefront of the fight to establish good relations between China and the West. Both authors have recently been to China. In these articles, they tell you what they know from their own personal experience.

Be sure you get your copy of next month's MR. Use the issue to acquaint your friends with MR and to expand its circulation.

(continued from inside front cover)

The status of the O'Connor case is still the same as it was last month: O'Connor has been *cited* but not yet *indicted*. By the time this reaches you he may have been indicted, or that may not happen for another month or even longer. Meanwhile, we are glad to be able to report that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (421 Seventh Avenue, New York 1, N. Y.), grasping the true importance of the O'Connor case, has decided to make this case its major activity and has appointed a strong subcommittee to take charge of operations. We are informed that plans to date include:

- (1) Preparing and distributing as widely as possible a short pamphlet explaining what the case is all about.
- (2) Enlisting the support of all persons and organizations who are known to have come out against McCarthyism and book burning.
- (3) Planning an O'Connor meeting in New York near the end of October.
- (4) Encouraging the formation all over the country of local committees or groups that can publicize the issues in the O'Connor case and stimulate popular support for the fight against McCarthyism.

All this will take money and volunteers—lots of both. We are turning over funds sent in response to our last month's appeal on behalf of O'Connor's defense to ECLC for these activities, and we strongly urge readers to contribute to the limit of their ability. Likewise, if you can undertake to help organize a defense group in your community, get in touch with ECLC (address above).

Our own heartfelt thanks, meanwhile, to the many MR readers who contributed to the "anti-inquisition fund" we were forced to raise to meet Leo Huberman's expenses arising out of his being called before the McCarthy Committee in July. Thanks to your prompt and generous response, enough money was raised to take care of *that* money worry: we can go back to our job of putting out the best magazine we know how to. There was even a small surplus which has been added to the O'Connor defense fund.

On page 288 we announce the publication next month of two important articles on China—one by Joan Robinson, world-famous British economist who went to China last summer with a delegation of British businessmen, and the other by Geoffrey Bing, Labor MP, who went to China in 1952 and has since taken a leading part in the campaign to normalize relations between New China and the West.

And in this connection, may we call your attention to another excellent source of information about New China, the book by Mrs. Mary Austin Endicott entitled *Five Stars over China*. Mrs. Endicott lived and worked in China for 22 years before returning to her home in Canada. Then in 1952, with her missionary husband James G. Endicott, she returned for four eventful months to China. The book tells what she saw and learned. It can be obtained (cloth \$3.50, paper \$2) from the office of the Endicott's first-rate periodical *Canadian Far Eastern Newsletter*, 134 Glenholme Avenue, Toronto 10, Canada.

Another fine publication by a China expert (but not limited to China) is the mimeographed letter *Today* put out monthly by Anna Louise Strong (Box 161, Montrose, California—subscription price \$1).

Build Your Socialist Library—

AT BARGAIN PRICES

Enclosed find \$..... (add 50c for any address outside U.S.A.)

- ☐ \$ 3.00 for a one-year subscription to *Monthly Review*
- ☐ \$ 4.00 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:
..... *Man's Worldly Goods* by Leo Huberman
..... *The Bending Cross* by Ray Ginger
..... *MR Pamphlet Packet* (7 pamphlets)
- ☐ \$ 5.00 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:
..... *The Truman Era* by I. F. Stone
..... *The Treason of the Senate* by David Graham Phillips
..... *The World The Dollar Built* by Gunther Stein
..... *The Present As History* by Paul M. Sweezy
- ☐ \$11.00 for all six books and the Pamphlet Packet
- ☐ \$13.00 for six books, Pamphlet Packet, and a one-year sub

List price of the six books and pamphlets—\$23.75

You pay—\$11.00

YOU SAVE—\$12.75

WITH SUB OR RENEWAL, YOU SAVE \$13.75.

(If you have ordered one or two or three of the books, and want to order the others, you can do so. Just send us the balance of the amount due, and indicate the books you are entitled to.)

Name

Street

City Zone State

☐ New subscription

Renewal ☐

All prices include postage. Send your order, with payment enclosed, to
Monthly Review, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

